



MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION

The Michigan Indigent Defense Commission ensures that quality public defense services are accessible to all eligible adults charged with a criminal offense in Michigan.

Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025, Time: 9:30 a.m.
Michigan Bankers Association
507 S. Grand Ave, Lansing, MI 48933

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll call and opening remarks
3. Introduction of Commission members and guests
4. Public comment
5. Additions to agenda
6. Consent agenda (**action item**)
 - a. April 22, 2025 Meeting Minutes
7. Chair Report
8. Executive Director Report
 - a. FY2026 Grant Contract (**action item**)
9. Commission Business
 - a. Standing Committee Reports
 - i. Executive Committee
 - ii. Training and Evaluation Committee
 - iii. Indigence and Compensation Committee
 - b. Ad Hoc Committee Report
 - i. Indirect Costs
 - c. Regional Update: Wayne County MI, *Jessica Paladino, Regional Manager*

~break for lunch ~

- d. MIDC Standards Implementation
 - i. FY24 Compliance Year End Reporting
 - Unexpended Balances
 - Notice of Non-Compliance
 - Chippewa County (resolved)
 - City of Inkster (resolved)
 - Houghton County
 - Eaton County (resolved)
 - Wayne County
 - ii. FY25 Compliance Planning
 - Overview of funding distributed to date
 - Budget adjustments (information items)
 - Changes to approved plans
 - City of Ferndale (action item)
 - Calhoun County (information item)
 - Notice of Non-Compliance
 - Presque Isle County
 - Wayne County
 - Wexford County
 - iii. FY26 Compliance Plans and Costs (action items)

Staff recommends approval of the plans and costs:

1. Branch County
2. Ionia County
3. St. Clair County
4. Midland County
5. Charter Township of Waterford
6. City of Birmingham
7. City of St Clair Shores
8. Schoolcraft County
9. City of Grosse Pointe Woods
10. City of Taylor
11. City of Wayne

12. City of Wyandotte
13. Berrien County
14. City of Grand Rapids
15. Ottawa County
16. Grand Traverse County
17. Manistee and Benzie Counties
18. City of Dearborn Heights
19. City of Harper Woods
20. City of Livonia
21. Grosse Ile Township
22. Township of Redford
23. Clinton County
24. Gratiot County
25. Eaton County
26. Livingston County

Staff recommends approval of the plans and partial approval of the costs:

27. Sanilac County
28. Shiawassee County
29. Washtenaw County

Staff recommends disapproval of the plans and costs:

30. Allegan County
31. Van Buren County
32. Barry County
33. Cass County
34. Kent County
35. Montcalm County
36. Muskegon County
37. Charter Township of Shelby
38. City of Eastpointe
39. City of Hazel Park
40. City of Madison Heights
41. City of Pontiac
42. City of Roseville

43. City of Royal Oak
44. City of Sterling Heights
45. City of Warren
46. Lapeer County
47. Macomb County
48. Oakland County
49. Iosco County
50. Antrim County
51. Leelanau County
52. Dickinson County
53. Emmet County
54. Gogebic County
55. Ontonagon County
56. Kalkaska County
57. Luce County
58. Mackinac County
59. Otsego County
60. Canton Township
61. City of Allen Park
62. City of Dearborn
63. City of Garden City
64. City of Grosse Pointe
65. City of Grosse Pointe Farms
66. City of Grosse Pointe Park
67. City of Hamtramck
68. City of Highland Park
69. City of Inkster
70. City of Romulus
71. City of Southgate
72. City of Detroit
73. Genesee County
74. Hillsdale County
75. Ingham County
76. Lenawee County
77. Calhoun County

78. Kalamazoo County
79. St. Joseph County
80. City of Farmington
81. City of Ferndale
82. City of Oak Park
83. City of Southfield
84. Clinton Township
85. Clare and Gladwin Counties
86. Lake County
87. Mason County
88. Mecosta County
89. Newaygo County
90. Oceana County
91. Osceola County
92. Alpena County
93. Montmorency County
94. Oscoda County
95. Alcona County
96. Arenac County
97. Bay County
98. Huron County
99. Isabella County
100. Ogemaw County
101. Roscommon County
102. Saginaw County
103. Tuscola County
104. Cheboygan County
105. Houghton, Baraga, and Keweenaw Counties
106. Presque Isle County
107. Alger County
108. Charlevoix County
109. Chippewa County
110. Crawford County
111. Delta County
112. Iron County

- 113. Marquette County
- 114. Menominee County
- 115. Wexford and Missaukee Counties
- 116. City of Lincoln Park
- 117. Wayne County
- 118. Jackson County
- 119. Monroe County
- 120. City of Westland

10. Adjourn – next meeting August 19, 2025 beginning at 9:30 a.m.

Online Access: For members of the public who wish to join the meeting online, please email Jacklyn Downer at DownerJ1@michigan.gov or contact Jackie by phone at 517-582-1741 to request a Zoom link. This link will be provided in the morning before the meeting begins.

Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Meeting Minutes

The meeting was held in person at the Michigan Bankers Association building in Lansing, Michigan. Remote access via Zoom was available for Commissioners and, upon request, for members of the public. The MIDC website and meeting notice included information for members of the public on how to contact the MIDC to obtain the Zoom link for participation. Commissioners were able to participate remotely if they qualified for an exemption under the Open Meetings Act or if they requested an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC 12131 *et. seq.*, and Rehabilitation Act, MCL 395.81 *et. seq.*, pursuant to Attorney General Opinion No. 7318.

April 22, 2025

Time: 9:30 am

Michigan Bankers Association
507 S. Grand Ave, Lansing, MI 48933

Commission Members Participating

The following members participated in person:

- Chair Tracey Brame
- Thomas Adams
- Kimberly Buddin
- Paul Bullock
- Michael Carter
- Christine Green
- Loren Khogali
- James Krizan
- Debra Kubitskey
- Judge Paula Mathes
- Margaret McAvoy
- Glenn Simmington
- Rob VerHeulen

The following Commissioners were absent:

- Andrew DeLeeuw
- Judge James Fisher
- David Jones
- Tom McMillin

The following members requested accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate via Zoom:

- Gary Walker (Chocolay Township, Marquette County, Michigan)

Non-voting member Alicia Moon observed the meeting via Zoom but did not participate in the discussions.

Chair Brame called the meeting to order at 9:35 am.

Public Comment

The following people provided public comment:

- Pete Menna
- Robin Dillard Russaw
- Natalie Erickson

Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Adams moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. Commissioner Kubitskey seconded. The motion carried.

Consent Agenda

Commissioner Kubitskey moved that the consent agenda containing the minutes from the open and closed sessions of the February meeting be adopted, with the correction of Commissioner Carter's name being removed from the list of absent members. Commissioners Krizan seconded. The motion carried.

Chair's Report

Chair Brame attended the MIDC's youth defense conference held in March at Cooley Law School. She gave an overview of the legislative committee meeting that she attended with Executive Director Kristen Staley.

Chair Brame appointed members to the Commission's standing and ad hoc committees.

Executive Director Report

Ms. Staley provided an overview of legislative presentations that took place in March.

She gave an update on the compliance planning process to date and described the need for an IT solution to assist systems in tracking attorneys' cases.

Commissioner Adams moved to authorize the Executive Director to begin working with LARA to develop an RFP for standards data tracking. Commissioner Kubitskey seconded. The motion carried.

Executive Committee

Chair Brame updated Commissioners about the Executive Committee's meeting.

Regional Update

Matthew Lozen, Regional Manager for the MIDC's Mid Michigan region, gave an overview of the activities in his region.

MIDC Standards Implementation

Deputy Director Marla McCowan provided an update on staff's communication with the City of Inkster.

Commissioner VerHeulen moved that the City of Inkster be given until the end of May 9 to bring their FY24 reporting into compliance and to authorize MIDC staff to initiate the procedures described in MCL 780.995 if reporting is not submitted. Commissioner Bullock seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. McCowan provided an overview of the change requested by Gratiot County to that County's approved compliance plan and cost analysis. The County requested \$138,177.14 be added to their total system costs for a reimbursement pursuant to MCL 783.993(16).

Commissioner Bullock moved that the FY25 costs for Gratiot County be increased to reimburse for overspending in FY24. Commissioner Adams seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. McCowan provided an overview of the plan change to the County's indigency screening process. There is no additional change to the approved cost analysis.

Commissioner Krizan moved that the change to the compliance plan requested by Menominee County as to indigency screening procedures be approved. Commissioner Khogali seconded. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 am.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 24, 2025 at 9:30 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Marcela Westrate

GRANT NO 202~~65~~-XX

GRANT BETWEEN
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION (MIDC)
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS (LARA)
AND
XXXXX

GRANTEE/ADDRESS:

Name: XXX

Title:

Address:

Phone: XXX

GRANTOR/ADDRESS:

Michigan Indigent Defense Commission

Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs

611 W. Ottawa St.

Lansing, MI 48933

(517) 657-3060

GRANT PERIOD:

From: 10/01/202~~54~~ to 09/30/202~~65~~

TOTAL AUTHORIZED BUDGET: \$XXX

State Grant Contribution: XXX

Local Share Contribution:

ACCOUNTING DETAIL:

Accounting Template No.: XXX

SIGMA Vendor Code: XXX

GRANT

This is Grant # 202~~65~~-xx between the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission (Grantor), and XXX (Grantee), subject to terms and conditions of this grant agreement (Agreement).

1.0 Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this Grant is to provide funding to assist the Grantee (also referred to as local funding unit) to comply with the Compliance Plan and Cost Analysis approved by the MIDC for the provision of indigent criminal defense services ~~through the~~for all minimum standards approved by LARA ~~on May 22, 2017, October 28, 2021, October 28, 2022, and October 24, 2023~~, and the process described in the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Act (MIDC Act). The funding for this grant is contingent upon an appropriation by the Legislature that is signed by the Governor. Consistent with the MIDC Act, in the event that the funds appropriated apply to less than all of the minimum standards, the funding unit will not be required to fully comply with all of the minimum standards. In the event that an appropriation is insufficient to fully fund this grant, the amount of the grant will be reduced by the Grantor and the funding unit will not be required to fully comply with the minimum standards the original approved grant was designed to allow.

1.1 Definitions

- A. Budget means the detailed statement of estimated costs approved as the Grantee's Cost Analysis and required to implement the Compliance Plan.
- B. Budget Category means the aggregate of all funds in each of the high-level categories within the approved Cost Analysis.
- C. Compliance Plan or Plan is the plan submitted by the local funding unit and approved by the MIDC that specifically addresses how the Grantee shall meet the approved minimum standards established by the MIDC.
- D. Cost Analysis is a statement of the types of expenditures and funding necessary to bring Grantee's indigent defense system into compliance with the approved minimum standards established by the MIDC, including a statement of the funds in excess of the Grantee's local share as defined under the MIDC Act and as outlined in the Compliance Plan.
- E. MIDC Act means the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Act, Public Act 93 of 2013, MCL 780.991 et seq., as amended, enacted for the purpose of creating the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission and creating minimum standards for the local delivery of indigent criminal defense services that meet the constitutional requirements for the effective assistance of counsel.
- F. Subgrantee means a governmental agency or other legal entity to which an MIDC subgrant is awarded by the Grantee. This includes nonprofit entities providing indigent defense services on behalf of the Grantee. Attorneys representing indigent defendants, including both public defenders and attorneys contracted to represent indigent defendants, individual public defender office employees, judges, magistrates, court personnel, and professional service contract vendors shall not be considered subgrantees.
- G. "Substantial Change" to a Compliance Plan is a change to the Plan or Cost Analysis that alters the method of meeting the objectives of the standard(s) in

the approved Plan.

1.2 Statement of Work

The Grantee agrees to undertake, perform, and complete the services described in its approved Compliance Plan and in accordance with the MIDC Act, specifically Standards 1 through 8 and the MIDC Standard on Indigency and Contribution. The Parties to this Agreement enter into this Agreement to facilitate the process described in the MIDC Act, which controls or supersedes any terms of this Agreement. Consistent with the Act and when applicable, an indigent criminal defense system shall comply with the terms of this Agreement in bringing its system into compliance with the minimum standards established by the MIDC within 180 days after receiving funds from the MIDC. Grantee may exceed 180 days for compliance with a specific item needed to meet minimum standards as set forth in the Act. Grantee's Compliance Plan, as submitted and approved by the MIDC, addresses the prescribed methods Grantee has chosen to provide indigent criminal defense services pursuant to MCL 780.993(3). Any substantial changes to the work described in the Compliance Plan must be submitted to the MIDC for approval as set forth in this Agreement prior to any changes being implemented. All provisions and requirements of this Agreement shall apply to any agreements the Grantee may enter into in furtherance of its obligations under this Agreement and Grantee shall be responsible for the performance of any Subgrantee work, as defined in subsection 1.1.

1.3 Detailed Budget

- A. This Agreement does not commit the State of Michigan (State) or the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) to approve requests for additional funds at any time.
- B. If applicable, travel expenses will not be reimbursed at rates greater than the State Travel Rates, without the prior written consent of the MIDC.
- C. The Grantee agrees that all funds are to be spent as detailed in the Budget, unless a budget adjustment request is approved. See section 1.3(E).
- D. Grantee will maintain a restricted fund within their Local Chart of Accounts for the sole purpose of accounting for the expenses and revenue sources for operation of this grant and the local adult indigent defense system.
- E. All requests for a budget adjustment or substantial changes to the Grantee's Compliance Plan will be submitted quarterly with the Grantee's quarterly report. MIDC staff shall respond to a request in writing within 30 days of receipt.
 - 1) Budget adjustments less than or equal to 15% of the Budget Category total, including adjustments between Budget Categories, do not require approval by MIDC staff, but must be reported quarterly in the next financial status report.
 - 2) A Budget adjustment involving greater than 15% or \$10,000 (whichever is greater) of the aggregate of all funding within a Budget Category requires prior written approval by MIDC Staff and must be reported to the MIDC as soon after the Grantee is aware of the necessity of the Budget adjustment and reported in the Grantee's quarterly report.

- 3) Any substantial change to a Compliance Plan requires prior approval by MIDC staff and MIDC Commission.

1.4 Payment Schedule

The maximum amount of grant assistance approved is xxxx

Grantee must report and certify to Grantor by October 31st of each year the balance of any unexpended indigent defense grant funds from the prior fiscal year grant plus any interest earned on the advancement of the state grant funds in the previous fiscal year. Any funds from the previous fiscal year contained in an approved extension of the previous fiscal year's grant for projects that will be completed after September 30, 202~~5~~³ will be carried over into the current fiscal year and shall not be considered unexpended funds, nor be included in the balance of unexpended funds. The current fiscal year indigent defense grant funds advanced will be reduced by the amount of unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year's grant by reducing the 2nd and 3rd and 4th disbursement equally. The maximum amount of grant assistance approved includes the unexpended funds reported from the previous fiscal year.

An initial advance of 25% of the State Grant shall be made to the Grantee upon receipt by the Grantor of a signed Agreement. The Grantor shall make subsequent disbursements of up to 25% of the total state grant amount in accordance with the following schedule:

Initial Advance of 25% of total grant – Within 15 days of receipt of executed agreement

25% disbursement – January 15, 202~~6~~⁵

25% disbursement – April 15, 202~~6~~⁵

25% disbursement – July 15, 202~~6~~⁵ (final payment)

The above schedule of disbursement of funds is contingent upon receipt of quarterly reporting as addressed in this section and section 1.5 of this document. Any disputed matters shall not cause delay in remitting any disbursements or in issuing a grant contract and funds for the next fiscal year. Disputed matters shall be acted on independently from undisputed matters. The financial status report (FSR) report must be submitted on the form provided by the MIDC/LARA and indicate:

Grant funds received to date;

Expenditures for the reporting period by budget category; and;

Cumulative expenditures to date by budget category;

The quarterly FSR must be supported and accompanied by documentation of those grant funded expenditures incurred for the reporting period, including but not limited to:

- The general ledger for the restricted local indigent defense fund, including a detailed expenditure report with all expenditure detail within the budget categories, which must include documentation of payments to contract attorneys either by individual invoice or by report of payments made, by attorney;

- All invoices related to experts and investigators;
- All invoices related to construction; and
- Personnel detail including full-time equivalency of any grant funded positions, including total compensation for that position;

Invoices are to be provided by contract or non-employee Managed Assigned Counsel Administrators and for all contract attorneys providing direct service representation in the manner or rate in which the service is approved in the cost analysis for the indigent defense system, to track time in hourly increments where hourly rates are provided and provide specific details regarding the services performed for the billing period.

Upon request, Grantee shall provide the MIDC with additional documentation/verification of expenditures under the grant within 30 days of the making of the request. Any additional documentation/verification of expenditures shall not delay issuance of a grant contract or grant disbursements. Grantee's documentation of expenditures shall be maintained according to record retention policies for audit purposes in order to comply with this Agreement. Grantee will be held to the full contribution of the Local Share within the original one-year grant period.

The quarterly FSR and standards compliance reports as addressed in Section 1.5, shall be provided in accordance with the following schedule:

Initial FSR and compliance report for 10/1/2~~54~~–12/31/2~~54~~ – January 31, 202~~65~~

2nd FSR and compliance report for 1/1/2~~65~~-3/31/2~~65~~ – April 30, 202~~65~~

3rd FSR and compliance report for 4/1/2~~65~~-6/30/2~~65~~ – July 31, 202~~65~~

Final FSR and compliance report for 7/1/2~~65~~-9/30/2~~65~~ – October 31, 202~~65~~

Any reporting subsequently returned by MIDC Staff should be corrected and resubmitted for review within seven business days.

1.5 Monitoring and Reporting Program Performance

- Monitoring. The Grantee shall monitor performance to assure that time schedules are being met and projected work is being accomplished.
- Quarterly Reports. The Grantee shall submit to the Grantor quarterly program reports on compliance with the minimum standards and participate in follow up and evaluation activities. Compliance reports include narrative responses containing a description of the Grantee's compliance with Standards 1-8 and the Standard on Indigency and Compensation,

identifying problems or delays, actual, real or anticipated and any significant deviation from the approved Compliance Plan. Grantee will use its best efforts to provide data relevant to assessing compliance as contained in the compliance reporting template requested by MIDC. If Grantee is unable to provide the information requested by the report, Grantee will demonstrate in writing the steps taken to assess what information is currently available and how to retrieve it. Grantee also agrees to work with MIDC research staff to seek additional options or ideas for the collection and retrieval of this information.

PART II - GENERAL PROVISIONS

2.1 Project Changes

Grantee must obtain prior written approval for substantial changes to the compliance plan from Grantor.

2.2 Delegation

Grantee must notify the MIDC at least 90 calendar days before any proposed delegation with reasonable detail about Subgrantee and the nature and scope of the activities delegated. If any obligations under this Grant are delegated, Grantee must: (a) be the sole point of contact regarding all contractual project matters, including payment and charges for all Grant activities; (b) make all payments to the Subgrantee; and (c) incorporate the terms and conditions contained in this Grant in any subgrant with Subgrantee. Grantee remains responsible for the completion of the Grant activities and compliance with the terms of this Grant.

Where the Grantee uses a nonprofit entity to provide indigent defense services as contemplated in its compliance plan and cost analysis, this relationship is described as a subrecipient or subgrantee. The Grantee shall ensure that the contract or agreement defining the relationship with the nonprofit entity allows for reasonable access, in its sole discretion, to financial records for monitoring by the Grantee and its representatives.

A Subgrantee is required to comply with all conditions and restrictions applicable to the award given to the Grantee. The Grantee is responsible for ensuring a Subgrantee's compliance to the award's conditions and restrictions.

A Grantee must require a Subgrantee to do the following:

- Provide appropriate progress and financial reports to the Grantee;
- Be accountable to the Grantee for how it uses the State funds provided under the subaward;
- Follow applicable State rules regarding financial management, internal controls, cost principles, and audit requirements;
- Collect and provide performance data for the Grantee to include in its reports.

2.3 Program Income

To the extent that it can be determined that interest was earned on advances of funds, such interest shall be recorded in the Grantee's restricted indigent defense fund and included in the quarterly FSRs. The grant award shall not be increased by the amount of interest earned. Any grant funds attributable to interest and not spent at the end of the grant period shall be returned to the State or included in future grant awards from the MIDC consistent with MCL 780.993(15).

2.4 Share-in-savings

Grantor expects to share in any cost savings realized by Grantee in proportion of the grant funds to the local share.

2.5 Purchase of Equipment

The purchase of equipment must be made pursuant to Grantee's established purchasing policy and if not specifically listed in the Budget, Grantee must have prior written approval of Grantor. Equipment is defined as non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year. Such equipment shall be retained by Grantee unless otherwise specified at the time of approval.

2.6 Accounting

Grantee must establish and maintain a restricted indigent defense fund in its local chart of accounts to record all transactions related to the Grant. The restricted fund will not lapse to the local general fund at the close of Grantee's fiscal year. Grantee shall adhere to the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and shall maintain records which will allow, at a minimum, for the comparison of actual outlays with budgeted amounts. Grantee's overall financial management system must ensure effective control over and accountability for all indigent defense funds received. Where the Grantee uses a nonprofit entity to provide indigent defense services as contemplated in its compliance plan and cost analysis, the Grantee shall ensure that the contract or agreement defining the nonprofit entities relationship allows for reasonable access, in its sole discretion, to financial records for monitoring by the Grantee and its representatives. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation of expenditures including, but not limited to, balance sheets, general ledgers, payroll documents, time sheets and invoices. The expenditure of state funds shall be reported by line item and compared to the Budget.

2.7 Records Maintenance, Inspection, Examination, and Audit

Grantor or its designee may audit Grantee and the restricted indigent defense fund account to verify compliance with this Grant. Grantee must retain and provide to Grantor or its designee upon request, all financial and accounting records related to the Grant through the term of the Grant and for 7 years after the latter of termination, expiration, or final payment under this Grant or any extension ("Audit Period"). If an audit, litigation, or other action involving the records is initiated before the end of the Audit Period, Grantee must retain the records until all issues are resolved.

Within 10 calendar days of providing notice, Grantor and its authorized representatives or designees have the right to enter and inspect Grantee's premises or any other places where Grant activities are being performed, and examine, copy, and audit all records related to this Grant. Grantee must cooperate and provide reasonable assistance. If any financial errors have occurred, the amount in error must be reflected as a credit or debit on subsequent disbursements until the amount is paid or refunded. Any remaining balance must be reported by Grantee to Grantor by October 31 of each year as required under the MIDC Act.

This Section applies to Grantee, any parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization of Grantee, and any subgrantee that performs Grant activities in connection with this Grant.

2.8 Competitive Bidding

Grantee agrees that all procurement transactions involving the use of state funds shall be conducted in a manner that provides maximum open and free competition, consistent with Grantee's purchasing policies. Sole source contracts should be negotiated to the extent that such negotiation is possible. Attorney contracts for representation of indigent or partially indigent defendants, and contracts for managed assigned counsel coordinators, are exempt from a competitive bid process but must meet standard internal procurement policies, as applicable.

3.0 Liability

The State is not liable for any costs incurred by Grantee before the start date or after the end date of this Agreement. Liability of the State is limited to the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the total grant amount.

3.1 Safety

Grantee and all subgrantees are responsible for ensuring that all precautions are exercised at all times for the protection of persons and property. Safety provisions of all Applicable Laws and building and construction codes shall be observed. Grantee and every subgrantee are responsible for compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations in any manner affecting the work or performance of this Agreement and shall at all times carefully observe and comply with all rules, ordinances, and regulations. Grantee, and all subgrantees shall secure all necessary certificates and permits from municipal or other public authorities as may be required in connection with the performance of this Agreement.

3.2 Indemnification

Each party to the Grant must seek its own legal representation and bear its own legal costs; including judgments, in any litigation which may arise from the performance of this Grant and/or Agreement. It is specifically understood and agreed that neither party will indemnify the other party in any such litigation.

3.3 Failure to Comply and Termination

A. Failure to comply with duties and obligations under the grant program as set forth in Public Act 93 of 2013, as amended, is subject to the procedures contained in sections 15 and 17 of the Act.

B. Termination for Convenience

Grantor may immediately terminate this Grant in whole or in part without penalty and for any reason, including but not limited to, appropriation or budget shortfalls. If Grantor terminates this Grant for convenience, Grantor will pay all reasonable costs for approved Grant responsibilities. If the parties cannot agree to the cost to be paid by the Grantor, the parties shall attempt to resolve the dispute by mediation pursuant to MCL 780.995. Grantee's duty to comply with MIDC standards is limited to funding covering the cost of compliance as set forth in the Act.

3.4 Conflicts and Ethics

Grantee will uphold high ethical standards and is prohibited from: (a) holding or acquiring an interest that would conflict with this Grant; (b) doing anything that creates an appearance of impropriety with respect to the award or performance of the Grant; (c) attempting to influence or appearing to influence any State employee by the direct or indirect offer of anything of value; or (d) paying or agreeing to pay any person, other than employees and consultants working for Grantee, any consideration contingent upon the award of the Grant. Grantee must immediately notify Grantor of any violation or potential violation of this Section. This Section applies to Grantee, any parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization of Grantee, and any subgrantee that performs Grant activities in connection with this Grant.

3.5 Non-Discrimination

Under the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, 1976 PA 453, MCL 37.2101 to 37.2804, and the Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act, 1976 PA 220, MCL 37.1101, et seq., Grantee and its subgrantees agree not to discriminate against an employee or applicant for employment with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, or a matter directly or indirectly related to employment, because of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, height, weight, marital status, partisan considerations, or a disability or genetic information that is unrelated to the person's ability to perform the duties of a particular job or position. Breach of this covenant is a material breach of this Grant.

3.6 Unfair Labor Practices

Under MCL 423.324, the State may void any Grant with a grantee or subgrantee who appears on the Unfair Labor Practice register compiled under MCL 423.322.

3.7 Force Majeure

Neither party will be in breach of this Grant because of any failure arising from any disaster or act of God that are beyond its control and without its fault or negligence. Each party will use commercially reasonable efforts to resume performance. Grantee will not be relieved of a breach or delay caused by its subgrantees except where the MIDC determines that an unforeseeable condition prohibits timely compliance pursuant to MCL 780.993, Sec. 13(11).

4.0 Certification Regarding Debarment

Grantee certifies, by signature to this Agreement, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this Agreement by any federal or state department or agency. If Grantee is unable to certify to any portion of this statement, Grantee shall attach an explanation to this Agreement.

4.1 Illegal Influence

Grantee certifies, to the best of its knowledge and belief that:

- A. No federal appropriated funds have been paid nor will be paid, by or on behalf of Grantee, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant, the making of any federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.
- B. If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this grant, the Grantee shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
- C. Grantee shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all grants or subcontracts and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

The State has relied upon this certification as a material representation. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for entering into this Agreement imposed by 31 USC 1352. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Grantee certifies, to the best of its knowledge and belief that no state funds have been paid nor will be paid, by or on behalf of Grantee, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any state agency, a member of the Legislature, or an employee of a member of the Legislature in connection with the awarding of any state contract, the making of any state grant, the making of any state loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any state contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.

4.2 Governing Law

This Grant is governed, construed, and enforced in accordance with Michigan law, excluding choice-of-law principles. All claims relating to, or arising out of, this Grant are governed by Michigan law, excluding choice-of-law principles. Any dispute arising from this Grant must be resolved as outlined in Sec. 15 of PA93 of 2013, as amended.

4.3 Disclosure of Litigation, or Other Proceeding

Grantee must notify Grantor within 14 calendar days of receiving notice of any litigation, investigation, arbitration, or other proceeding (collectively Proceeding) that arises during the term of the Grant against a public defender office, an attorney employed by a public defender office, or an attorney contracted to perform indigent defense functions funded by the Grantee that involves: (a) a criminal Proceeding; (b) a civil Proceeding involving a claim that, after consideration of Grantee's insurance coverages, would adversely affect Grantee's viability; (c) a civil Proceeding involving a governmental or public entity's claim or written allegation of fraud related to performance of the Grant; or (d) a Proceeding challenging any license that an attorney practicing on behalf of a public defender office or an attorney practicing pursuant to a contract to perform indigent defense functions for Grantee is required to possess in order to perform under this Grant.

4.4 Assignment

Grantee may not assign this Grant to any other party without the prior approval of Grantor. Upon notice to Grantee, Grantor, in its sole discretion, may assign in whole or in part, its rights or responsibilities under this Grant to any other party. If Grantor determines that a novation of the Grant to a third party is necessary, Grantee will agree to the novation, provide all necessary documentation and signatures, and continue to perform its obligations under the Grant.

4.5 Entire Grant and Modification

This Grant is the entire agreement and replaces all previous agreements between the parties for the Grant activities. Pursuant to the MIDC Act, the MIDC shall promulgate policies necessary to carry out its powers and duties. The MIDC may also provide guides, instructions, informational pamphlets for the purpose of providing guidance and information with regard to the Grant and MIDC policies. This Agreement supersedes all terms of MIDC policies, guides, instructions, informational pamphlets and any other explanatory material that is in conflict with the Agreement. This Agreement may not be amended except by a signed written agreement between the parties.

4.6 Grantee Relationship

Grantee assumes all rights, obligations, and liabilities set forth in this Grant. Grantee, its employees, and its agents will not be considered employees of the State. No partnership or joint venture relationship is created by virtue of this Grant. Grantee, and not Grantor or the State of Michigan, is responsible for the payment of wages, benefits, and taxes of Grantee's employees. Prior performance does not modify Grantee's status as an independent grantee.

4.7 Dispute Resolution

The parties will endeavor to resolve any Grant dispute in accordance with section 15 of Public Act 93 of 2013. The dispute will be referred to the parties' respective representatives or program managers. Such referral must include a description of the issues and all supporting documentation. The parties will continue performing while a dispute is being resolved, unless the dispute precludes performance or performance would require Grantee to spend in excess of the Local Share as defined by MCL 780.983(h).

5.0 Severability

If any part of this Grant is held invalid or unenforceable, by any court of competent jurisdiction, that part will be deemed deleted from this Grant and the severed part will be replaced by agreed upon language that achieves the same or similar objectives. The remaining Grant will continue in full force and effect.

5.1 Signatories

The signatories warrant that they are empowered to enter into this Agreement and agree to be bound by it.

Signature:

Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Bureau of
Finance and Administrative Services
Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs
State of Michigan

Date:

Signature:

Michigan Indigent Defense Commission
Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs
State of Michigan

Date:

Signature:

Representative:

Date:

Funding Unit:

| GRANT NO. 202~~65~~-

Agency Name	Approved	1st Payment	2nd Payment	3rd Payment	4th Payment	Unexpended Balance	Overpay
Genesee County	\$15,962,465.71	\$3,990,616.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,990,616.43	\$14,587,714.58	(\$6,606,481.73)
Macomb County	\$14,451,193.16	\$3,612,798.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,612,798.29	\$12,301,644.68	(\$5,076,048.10)
Wayne County	\$47,177,970.20	\$11,794,492.55	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,794,492.55	28,343,797.99	(\$4,754,812.89)
Kent County	\$23,498,866.07	\$5,874,716.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,874,716.52	\$13,537,151.97	(\$1,787,718.94)
City of Warren	\$2,035,849.91	\$508,962.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$508,962.48	\$2,544,825.66	(\$1,526,900.71)
City of Pontiac	\$1,301,249.13	\$325,312.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$325,312.28	\$1,134,092.55	(\$483,467.98)
Osceola County	\$629,142.18	\$157,285.55	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$157,285.55	\$761,338.60	(\$446,767.52)
City of Eastpointe	\$1,854,632.90	\$463,658.23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$463,658.23	\$1,295,154.31	(\$367,837.87)
Lake County	\$499,381.87	\$124,845.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$124,845.47	\$563,705.25	(\$314,014.32)
Charter Township of Waterford	\$546,950.20	\$136,737.55	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$136,737.55	\$546,916.66	(\$273,441.56)
City of Roseville	\$1,551,398.81	\$387,849.70	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$387,849.70	\$975,742.68	(\$200,043.27)
Ogemaw County	\$641,995.99	\$160,499.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$160,499.00	\$499,840.87	(\$178,842.88)
Charlevoix County	\$735,629.45	\$183,907.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$183,907.36	\$520,007.61	(\$152,192.88)
Gogebic County	\$473,217.53	\$118,304.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$118,304.38	\$380,393.02	(\$143,784.25)
Hillsdale County	\$916,918.32	\$229,229.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$229,229.58	\$594,447.59	(\$135,988.43)
Emmet County	\$903,618.90	\$225,904.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$225,904.73	\$580,678.40	(\$128,868.96)
Lapeer County	\$1,062,590.17	\$265,647.54	\$265,647.54	\$0.00	\$265,647.54	\$375,781.62	(\$110,134.07)
Kalkaska County	\$564,573.37	\$141,143.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$141,143.34	\$358,199.86	(\$75,913.17)
Barry County	\$1,351,051.01	\$337,762.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$337,762.75	\$746,534.00	(\$71,008.49)
Presque Isle County	\$183,563.88	\$45,890.97	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,890.97	\$190,915.32	(\$99,133.38)
City of Inkster	\$107,290.00	\$26,822.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$26,822.50	\$64,690.85	(\$11,045.85)
Roscommon County	\$598,515.85	\$149,628.96	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$149,628.96	\$340,566.39	(\$41,308.46)
Iron County	\$709,036.31	\$177,259.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$177,259.09	\$395,722.40	(\$41,204.26)
City of Southfield	\$1,147,435.00	\$286,858.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$286,858.75	\$614,700.24	(\$40,982.74)
City of Sterling Heights	\$602,875.00	\$150,718.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$150,718.75	\$334,264.81	(\$32,827.31)
Ontonagon County	\$181,946.10	\$45,486.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,486.53	\$110,261.74	(\$19,288.70)
City of Grosse Pointe Park	\$20,857.02	\$5,214.26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,214.26	\$22,380.00	(\$11,951.50)
City of Grosse Pointe	\$17,910.11	\$4,477.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,214.87	(\$1,782.29)
Total							(\$23,133,792.51)

To: Michigan Indigent Defense Commission

From: Marla R. McCowan
Deputy Director/Director of Training

Re: Compliance Planning and Costs:
FY24 and FY25 status updates; FY26 Compliance Plans

Date: June 16, 2025

I. Funding Awards by Fiscal Year

	MIDC Funding	Local Share	Total System Costs
FY 2019	\$86,722,179.85	\$37,963,396.67 ¹	\$124,685,576.52
FY 2020	\$117,424,880.47	\$38,523,883.90	\$157,698,982.46
FY 2021	\$129,127,391.54	\$38,486,171.32	\$167,613,562.86
FY 2022	\$138,348,406.27	\$38,146,920.09	\$176,495,326.36
FY 2023	\$173,928,393.06	\$38,825,422.67	\$212,753,815.73
FY 2024	\$281,237,724.24	\$38,825,422.67	\$320,063,146.91
FY 2025 ²	\$295,282,167.22	\$38,825,422.67	\$334,107,589.89

The MIDC annually collects information about the balance of funds distributed to systems in a form completed by the local funding units due no later than October 31. See the MIDC Act, MCL 780.993(15).

¹ The annual inflationary increase described in MCL 780.983(i) is calculated from the FY2019 local share.

² The list of funding approved annually for each funding unit is on the MIDC's website, updated through April 2025.

II. FY24 Compliance Plans and Costs

A. Final Reporting

The fourth quarter of reporting from systems for FY24 (covering July 1, 2024 through September 30, 2024) was due by October 31, 2024. Funding units were required to enter the following reporting in EGrAMS:

- Attorney List
- Financial Status Report
- Quarterly Program Report
- Unexpended balance of Funds, pursuant to MCL 780.993(15)

MIDC staff published a document on the [grants page of the Commission's website](#) identifying changes to reporting for FY24, along with updated compliance reporting instructions, and a [recorded webinar](#) covering submission of reports through our EGrAMS. Sample invoicing for attorneys is available, along with a document relating to entering codes to capture various data points. The MIDC's Grant Manual was updated in February and posted to our Grants webpage as well.

As of this writing, nearly all reporting has been submitted and is either fully approved by MIDC Staff or pending finalization. The following reporting has not yet been finalized by the funding unit:

Funding Unit	Report Name	Reporting Through	Status
Houghton County	Financial Status Report	9/30/2024	Corrections
Houghton County	Financial Status Report	12/31/2023	Corrections
Houghton County	Report of Unexpended Grant Funds	9/30/2024	Pending

B. Notice of Noncompliance Issued

Pursuant to the [Compliance Resolution Process approved by the MIDC in June of 2021](#), the following systems received notices of noncompliance with the MIDC's Standards or grant contract terms:

1. Chippewa County

Failure to submit reports, issued 5-7-25 resolved 5-14-25.

2. City of Inkster

Failure to submit reports, issued 11-24-24, resolved 5-12-25.

3. Eaton County

Failure to submit reports, issued 5-7-25, resolved 5-20-25.

4. Houghton County

Failure to submit reports, issued 5-7-25.

5. [Wayne County](#)

On November 7, 2024, notice advising that the Compliance Resolution Process was being initiated was sent to the funding unit via U.S. Mail and electronic mail for the following reasons:

1. Failure to provide confidential meeting space for in-custody defendants to meet with assigned counsel as required by MIDC Standard 2 - initial interviews.

I made a site evaluation on June 4, 2025 in coordination with the local system stakeholders and architectural planners to evaluate the progress being made on confidential meeting space in the Criminal Justice Center. The work is ongoing and the progress is accurately described in the letter dated June 2, 2025 in the shared drive of materials.

III. FY25 Compliance Planning

A. Overview of status and funding distributed to date

As of the MIDC's October 15, 2024 meeting, all 120 compliance plans and cost analyses were approved, and communication regarding that status was sent through our grant management system. The MIDC has distributed contracts to all funding units and as of this writing all 120 have been fully executed by the local system, the MIDC, and LARA. Funding has been distributed pursuant to the contract terms, requiring:

Initial Advance of 25% of total grant – Within 15 days of receipt of executed agreement

25% disbursement – January 15, 2025

25% disbursement – April 15, 2025

25% disbursement – July 15, 2025 (upcoming final payment)

The current fiscal year's grant funds advanced are reduced by the amount of unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year's grant by reducing the 2nd and 3rd disbursement equally.

The schedule of disbursement of funds is contingent upon receipt of quarterly reporting.

B. Budget Adjustments

The Grants Director processed and approved the following [budget adjustment requests](#) (line item transfer requests) pursuant to the process set forth in the MIDC's Grant Manual at p. 41 (February 2024):

- Cheboygan County
- City of Detroit
- City of Farmington
- City of Harper Woods
- City of Oak Park
- City of Roseville
- City of Royal Oak
- City of Taylor
- Clinton County
- Emmet County
- Genesee County
- Marquette County
- Menominee County
- Muskegon County
- Otsego County
- Schoolcraft County
- St. Clair County

C. Changes to Approved Plans

1. City of Ferndale (**action item**)

During the Q2 reporting period, it was discovered by MIDC staff that the funding unit was paying “shift rates” (instead of hourly, as approved in the compliance plan) and that four attorneys had been underpaid when compared to the minimum hourly requirements. The funding unit subsequently requested to amend D43-2's FY25 plan to reflect that Ferndale is a “hybrid” system, meaning that its system is composed of

both shifts and individual appointments. This action, if approved, will not require additional grant funds. As of 4/28/2025, the four underpaid attorneys on the Ferndale roster were issued checks to make up the difference to reflect the underpayment and recorded properly with corrections made and submitted to MIDC reporting.

Staff recommends approval.

2. Calhoun County (information item)

System increased their rates for life offense cases from \$180 to \$185/hr, retroactive to October 1, 2024. No additional funds are needed to facilitate the rate change at this time.

D. Reporting Due

The MIDC Staff hosted live webinars on December 11 and December 13 covering a variety of topics related to grant management in this new fiscal year. The slides from the webinar were subsequently emailed to all defender leaders and posted to the MIDC's website. Daily zoom-based "office hours" were offered by MIDC staff daily the week of January 27, ahead of the first quarterly reporting due date. The first quarter of reporting from systems for FY25 (covering October 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024) was due by January 31, 2025 and the second quarter of reporting (covering January 1, 2025 through March 31, 2025) was due by April 30, 2025. Funding units were required to enter the following reporting in EGrAMS:

- Attorney List
- Financial Status Report
- Quarterly Program Report

Most funding units have submitted their reporting timely and those reports are currently being reviewed by MIDC staff if not already

approved. The following reporting remains unsubmitted and pending with the funding unit:

Funding Unit	Report Name	Report Through	Status
Cheboygan County	Attorney List	3/31/2025	Pending
Cheboygan County	Financial Status Report	3/31/2025	Pending
City of Royal Oak	Quarterly Program Report	3/31/2025	Pending
Delta County	Attorney List	3/31/2025	Pending
Delta County	Quarterly Program Report	3/31/2025	Pending
Hillsdale County	Attorney List	3/31/2025	Pending
Houghton County	Financial Status Report	3/31/2025	Pending
Presque Isle County	Attorney List	3/31/2025	Pending
Presque Isle County	Attorney List	12/31/2024	Pending
Presque Isle County	Financial Status Report	3/31/2025	Pending
Presque Isle County	Quarterly Program Report	3/31/2025	Pending

E. Notice of Noncompliance Issued

The following systems received a notice of noncompliance for failing to timely submit the first quarter of reporting due January 31, 2025:

- Presque Isle County
- Wayne County (reporting submitted, pending review by staff)
- Wexford County (resolved June 12, 2025)

IV. FY26 Compliance Planning (action items)

All funding units were required to submit a plan for compliance with all approved MIDC Standards pursuant MCL §780.993, which provides:

(3) No later than 180 days after a standard is approved by the department, each indigent criminal defense system shall submit a plan to the MIDC for the provision of indigent criminal defense services in a manner as determined by the MIDC and shall submit an annual plan for the following state fiscal year on or before October 1 of each year. A plan submitted under this subsection must specifically address how the minimum standards established by the MIDC under this act will be met and must include a cost analysis for meeting those minimum standards. The standards to be addressed in the annual plan are those approved not less than 180 days before the annual plan submission date. The cost analysis must include a statement of the funds in excess of the local share, if any, necessary to allow its system to comply with the MIDC's minimum standards.

(4) The MIDC shall approve or disapprove all or any portion of a plan or cost analysis, or both a plan and cost analysis, submitted under subsection (3), and shall do so within 90 calendar days of the submission of the plan and cost analysis. If the MIDC disapproves any part of the plan, the cost analysis, or both the plan and the cost analysis, the indigent criminal defense system shall consult with the MIDC and, for any disapproved portion, submit a new plan, a new cost analysis, or both within 60 calendar days of the mailing date of the official notification of the MIDC's disapproval. If after 3 submissions a compromise is not reached, the dispute must be resolved as provided in section 15. All approved provisions of an indigent criminal defense system's plan and cost analysis must not be delayed by any disapproved portion and must proceed as provided in this act. The MIDC shall not approve a cost analysis or portion of a cost analysis unless it is reasonably and directly related to an indigent defense function.

Funding units are using the MIDC's Grant Management System (EGrAMS) to submit compliance plans. A detailed, self-guided tutorial was prepared for funding units and [linked on our website](#) along with resources and materials for planning.

Staff recommends approving the plan and cost analysis:

No significant changes from prior year:

Western Michigan Region:

1. [Branch County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 88%
FY 25 approved funding: \$1,765,087.25
Spending through Q2: 40%
FY 26 requested funding: \$1,801,615.91

County-based public defender office with 11 members including staff SWs and Investigators; 4 attorneys taking cases and covering all arraignments. Caseloads will be tracked quarterly, attorneys are obligated to provide caseload numbers from outside system. Data will be tracked by PD who will perform interviews, background check, and observations to ensure continuing quality of service. Any dispute will be handled by swap agreement with neighbor that does not have relationship with parties involved. PD will perform annual reviews with stakeholder feedback. Total budget increase of +\$36,528.66. Largest category increase in personnel and fringes, +\$25,561.20, related to multiple employee step increase and correlating fringes increase; +\$1,224.00 increase in contracts for attorneys based on projected needs; +\$8,000.00 increase in experts and investigators attributable to rate increases.

2. [Ionia County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 93%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,080,882.26

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,097,031.57

County-based public defender office with an internal conflict MAC overseeing 7 roster attorneys. System uses defenderData to track caseload percentages and PD will monitor regularly to monitor for adjustment, and will communicate with other systems to monitor outside assignments to roster attorneys; will notify verbally any attorney at capacity and cease assignments. PD will regularly court watch and get stakeholder input about performance and conduct at least annual reviews. Roster is required to attest to their qualifications. Minimal cost increases for COLA, contract attorney rates, and intern stipends.

Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair Region:

3. [St. Clair County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 88%

FY 25 approved funding: \$3,886,386.74

Spending through Q2: 40%

FY 26 requested funding: \$4,285,651.64

County-based public defender office with a roster of attorneys for overflow and conflict cases; PD office participates in new LMOS pilot project through MIDC that monitors and tracks attorney caseloads across the region. Compliance Supervisor will monitor assignments instead of PD Chief. Qualification and review of counsel done through surveys of attorneys by stakeholders. Adjustments needed to PD office salaries to achieve parity with county assistant prosecutors who unionized. Additional adjustment to overall staffing (+\$240,925.80) due to annual step increases and projected 3% COLA increases, minor increases in other categories, including Investigators (+15,000.00).

Contracts for attorneys (+\$26,640.00) due to hourly rate increases. Contracts, Other decreased by \$5.16. Case management software costs remained same. Significant supplies and services increase due to need for sustainable data storage (+\$115,667.15) and support staff hardware (+\$4200) and software (+\$2500) replacements and licensing. Other supplies and services increased due to inflation adjustments; training and travel (\$12,935.00) increased essentially due to mileage cost increases.

Mid-Michigan Region:

4. Midland County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 97%

FY 25 approved funding: \$777,704.97

Spending through Q2: 40%

FY 26 requested funding: \$799,725.84

County employee MAC handles arraignments and oversees roster of private attorneys. The MAC will use the Excel spreadsheet provided by MIDC to monitor attorney caseloads and collaborate with adjoining systems to ensure compliance. The MAC will notify in writing each attorney quarterly of their caseload levels and notified in writing when they reach their cap. The MAC identifies and determines participating counsel's qualifications by requiring each panel member to reveal the number and type of cases they have taken to trial to jury verdict. The MAC also verifies that the minimum thresholds for each qualification level have been attained by inquiring of the appropriate clerk's office the number of such cases by a panel member. Reviews are conducted annually; an appeal process exists to corporate counsel or nearby PD. Increases for MAC (+\$1,058.37), contracts for attorneys (+\$24,850), and transcripts (+\$3,500).

Minimal changes to compliance objectives; reductions in costs from prior year:

Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair Region:

5. [Charter Township of Waterford](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 30%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$579,006.38
Spending through Q2: 23%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$264,992.23

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of 26 attorneys. Attorney caseloads will be monitored through its internal database. To monitor the caseloads that attorneys are carrying in other systems they will continue to participate in LMOS pilot project. Review of counsel occurs via inter local agreement w/Oakland County IDSO, whose Standard 6/7 Compliance Attorney will review 1/3 of the total number of attorneys on its criminal appointment list, every three years using a detailed 5-step process, with a report back to the MAC for finalization. Significant decrease to Contracts for Attorneys (-\$302,059.30) based on projected needs; slight increases for other categories except for data collection where case management software eliminated from FY26 budget.

6. [City of Birmingham](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$765,675.00
Spending through Q2: 25%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$545,347.91

Part-time contract co-MACs overseeing a roster of attorneys. Birmingham has partnered with the Oakland County system to utilize the attorney employee to implement compliance with Standards 6 and 7. MAC still runs a monthly report of all cases assigned to attorneys and will share the report and collaborate with other local MACs in effort to

monitor caseloads in other systems i.e. LMOS pilot program. Currently, attorneys who wish to be added to Birmingham's roster provide information about their qualifications and other courts in which they practice. Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office has a Standard 6 & 7 Compliance Attorney who will be reviewing and court observing MIDC attorneys. Attorneys are reviewed every 3 years by compliance counsel. Decrease to contract for attorneys based on a budget reduction that also took into account increased hourly rates and addition of appeals (-\$221,077.09); slight decrease to experts and investigators due to reduced need for substance abuse evaluations (-\$350.00).

7. [City of St Clair Shores](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$435,956.85

Spending through Q2: 37%

FY 26 requested funding: \$263,504.73

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and engages in regional collaboration via participation in monthly LMOS pilot project to track attorney caseloads and monitors/audits caseload in tandem w/Macomb County PD Standard 6/7 Compliance Attorney. Attorneys to be notified of their qualification level in person via MAC, who along with MCOPD Compliance Attorney will now be responsible for reviewing counsel. Attorneys taking assignments will be reviewed and assessed at least once every 3 years by the Macomb County Compliance Attorney (or attorney designee). Comprehensive reviews will include a self-assessment, in-court observation, stakeholder surveys, input from interested parties, and other developed methods. No changes to most cost categories including personnel (\$29,260.85); decrease to attorney contracts despite hourly rate increase (-\$172,452.12).

*Northern MI Region:*8. Schoolcraft County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 64%

FY 25 approved funding: \$238,093.60

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$230,659.00

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys tracks caseloads using Excel, roster attorneys self-report other cases quarterly and the MAC collaborates with surrounding MACs to confirm caseload numbers reported by roster attorneys and new assignments are stopped if an attorney reaches caseload limits. The MAC assesses qualification level using guidelines in the grant manual, appeals are heard by the Delta MAC; reviews completed informally yearly, and formally every three years; MAC randomly reviews roster attorneys with active cases throughout the year, e.g. meeting with judges regarding attorney performance, monitoring court appearances, and checking in with clients at the end of representation. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$33,180) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; addition of CAFA on-call (\$26,040) for 14 days per month at \$155; addition of case related travel compensation (\$25,955).

*Wayne County Region:*9. City of Grosse Pointe Woods

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 84%

FY 25 approved funding: \$66,326.60

Spending through Q2: 41%

FY 26 requested funding: \$65,803.00

Small municipal court with a MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. The MACC utilizes an Excel Sheets system to track assignments

(misdemeanors only) and requires roster attorneys to report outside assignments; MAC will coordinate with other jurisdictions as caseload capacity nears. MAC reviews qualifications and reviews attorneys every three years; self-assessments will be requested periodically and outside input is encouraged. Overall decrease in budget (-\$523.50) based on projected caseload needs.

10. [City of Taylor](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 115%

FY 25 approved funding: \$497,289.40

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$496,443.37

This third class district court system participates in the Wayne County District Courts Regional Managed Assigned Counsel Office (RMACO) based in Dearborn, which oversees compliance with all MIDC Standards in coordination with local rosters of attorneys providing services. Personnel/COLA (+\$1,238.78), increase to contracts for attorneys (+90,194.00) due to an increase in the hourly rate and an addition of 141 hours based on projections. Added category for problem solving courts in the amount of \$60,580.00 (466 hours at \$130/hr). Prior year sought reimbursement for overspending, which is not repeated here (-\$91,678.81) and an anticipated over expenditure in FY24 of \$30,000. There was also funding in the FY25 plan for internet for iPads in the amount of \$600.00, which is not requested in FY26.

11. [City of Wayne](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 118%

FY 25 approved funding: \$268,711.98

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$223,497.18

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to personnel/COLA (+\$1.201.20), decrease to contracts for attorneys in the

amount of \$6,336.00 due to an increase in the hourly rate; no increase in hours for contacts for attorneys. Prior year sought reimbursement for overspending, which is not repeated here (-\$40,808.00).

12. [City of Wyandotte](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 118%

FY 25 approved funding: \$409,146.28

Spending through Q2: 37%

FY 26 requested funding: \$355,056.60

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Minor increase to personnel/COLA (+\$254.32), increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$10,656.00) due to an increase in the hourly rate; no increase in hours for contacts for attorneys. Prior year sought reimbursement for overspending, which is not repeated here (-\$65,000).

Increases or changes based on projected needs:

Western Michigan Region:

13. [Berrien County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$5,382,645.04

Spending through Q2: 49%

FY 26 requested funding: \$6,018,895.86

County-based 17-member public defender office with an external conflict MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. The public defender will monitor caseloads regularly and review for capacity quarterly; the MAC will coordinate data with PD to monitor roster using a spreadsheet. PD and MAC will make regular inquiry of out-of-system roster assignments and if cap is reached PD or MAC will reduce assignments until capacity is back. The public defender will determine qualifications based on several factors: including experience per MIDC guidelines, complaints,

observations, references, stakeholder comments. PD will track this info via spreadsheet and review annually; any dispute will be handled initially by PD and can be escalated to a review partner if necessary. Largest increase (+\$371,728.89) from personnel due to county pay scale increase impacting most positions across the board; increase (+\$187,500.00) to contracts for attorneys based on projected caseloads; increase in experts/investigators (+\$55,000) relating to increase investigator hourly rate and increase MAACs requests; increase in travel/training (\$32,383.49) due to increase in number of system attorneys which impact most lines in category as well as specific request for leadership training for 2 management attorney staff positions.

14. [City of Grand Rapids](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 102%

FY 25 approved funding: \$3,334,860.84

Spending through Q2: 51%

FY 26 requested funding: \$5,170,455.25

Large MAC system with high volume and high docket hours overseeing 42 roster attorneys. MAC monitors caseload through monthly reports within billing system; attorneys are required to submit non-system assignments in accordance with invoicing timeline. MAC will share caseload reports with any other system who shares any roster attorney. Comprehensive application process to join roster with performance evaluated once every three years, which includes performance feedback from the 61st District Court Chief Judge, as well as from other key stakeholders, including clients. Grand Rapids is requesting one new FTE to support administration of roster. This would bring total FTE to 2. Court system also covers two sobriety courts, one drug court, one domestic violence court, and one community outreach court. Increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$1,827,219.14) to support the overall anticipated new filings (+15%) increase.

15. [Ottawa County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 94%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$6,572,252.91
Spending through Q2: 34%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$7,392,309.10

Mid-size county public defender office with external conflict MAC. Public defender will use defenderData and MIDC spreadsheet to regularly monitor case assignments; once an attorney has reached capacity they will no longer receive appointments. PD/MAC will communicate with regional system to monitor roster caseloads, if PD caseloads are reached PD will utilize roster for overflow. System has sufficient qualified attorneys for 7. PD will engage in 1 on 1s, court observation, coaching and formal assessments, formal reviews will occur at least annually and any disputes will be handled by regional partner. Cost increases coming almost entirely from request for new staff and increases to personnel/fringes (+\$750,556) for 1 new management level position, 2 new entry level line attorneys, and 1 legal support staff. Increase in other contracts for new request for evidence discovery sharing and storage program (+\$48,436); Minor adjustments to travel and training for staff and roster.

Northern MI Region:

16. [Grand Traverse County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 86%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$2,605,120.00
Spending through Q2: 44%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$2,654,340.00

Contracted MAC office overseeing a roster of attorneys, regionalized with Antrim and Leelanau Counties; caseloads are monitored through CLIO case management system; attorneys will be notified when they are

getting close to the caseload cap, and again when they reach the cap; when an attorney's cap is reached, they will not be assigned new cases. Reviews are conducted annually by MAC to determine qualification level and provide feedback. Reviews include meeting with attorney, feedback from court personnel, court observation, and review of attorney invoices. Slight increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$5,943) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 and FY25 reporting; increase in experts and investigators (+\$25,000) to account for expected increase in usage due to charging of a cold case; addition of feasibility study (+\$25,000) to evaluate delivery model.

17. Manistee and Benzie Counties

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 91%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,182,486.71

Spending through Q2: 42%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,345,985.52

Regional public defender office with a contracted MAC for conflict cases; case management is used to track all assignments in the PD office; conflict MAC tracks conflict cases and provides numbers monthly to PD. In FY26 CLIO will be used instead of defenderData and all caseloads will be tracked in the CMS; roster attorneys self-report other county cases quarterly and other systems contacted to confirm numbers when necessary; attorneys are notified in writing and verbally if they reach cap and assignments discontinued. All attorneys were interviewed by Chief PD in December 2024 to set baseline qualification levels. Reviews will take place not less than every three years or as necessary to re-evaluate qualification levels, appeal process in place for any objections; Chief PD used standardized questions developed for the purpose of the review and stakeholders consulted as part of the review process. Increase in personnel (+\$44,281.20) due to increased hours for some positions and cost of living increases; Increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$49,798.08) due to Standard 8 rate increases and increase in MAC rate and hours; Increase in experts and investigators due to

increased usage in FY24 (+\$29,589.45); Addition of \$10,000 for new server to accommodate increased digital discovery.

Wayne County Region:

18. [City of Dearborn Heights](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 133%

FY 25 approved funding: \$266,389.58

Spending through Q2: 52%

FY 26 requested funding: \$379,285.29

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$101,040.00) due to an increase in the hourly rate and an increase in hours based on caseload review. This amount is in line with projections calculations based on FY24 attorney fee spending; system is also seeking reimbursement for overspending in prior fiscal years (+\$10,000.80).

19. [City of Harper Woods](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 122%

FY 25 approved funding: \$246,582.02

Spending through Q2: 56%

FY 26 requested funding: \$394,637.16

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$96,792.16) due to an increase in the hourly rate and an increase in hours based on caseload review. Soundproofing upgrades required for confidential meeting space (+\$4,863) and system is seeking reimbursement for overspending in prior fiscal years (+\$51,262.98).

20. [City of Livonia](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 100%

FY 25 approved funding: \$466,905.60

Spending through Q2: 59%

FY 26 requested funding: \$761,683.43

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$75,992.16) due to an increase in the hourly rate and an increase in hours based on caseload review. Polycom equipment is needed for attorney client meetings and docket management (+\$13,771.49) and system is seeking reimbursement for overspending in prior fiscal years (+\$100,000.03).

21. [Grosse Ile Township](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 98%

FY 25 approved funding: \$383,590.00

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$404,040.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to an increase in the hourly rate and an additional docket day added to schedule (+\$30,450); last year the system was reimbursed for overspending on direct services which is not repeated here (-\$10,000).

22. [Township of Redford](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 97%

FY 25 approved funding: \$416,184.00

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$597,860.00

Third class district court previously participated in RMACO, seeking to leave regional system and contract with a MAC to oversee the roster of attorneys providing services. During transition year, system will rely

on attorneys to self-report caseloads from outside jurisdictions. MAC will use MIDC guidelines to ensure qualified counsel is assigned to the appropriate cases and will create a review process for attorneys that includes regular court observation. Increases to costs for contracts for attorneys (+\$147,776) due to an hourly rate increase and the inclusion of costs for a contracted MAC. Additional cost categories have been added for Contracts/Other for an assistant for the MAC (+\$31,200). The FY26 Plan also includes training/travel (+\$1,840) and experts and investigators (+\$12,500) costs which were previously included in the City of Dearborn Plan.

South Central Region:

23. Clinton County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,022,242.47

Spending through Q2: 38%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,018,518.95

Regional employee MAC covers Clinton and Gratiot Counties. The MAC will track caseloads via spreadsheet and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. MAC will review attorney qualifications and will conduct bi-annual reviews. Personnel increase to salaries/COLAs (+\$5,647), increase to experts for increased requests and for 1 pending *Poole* case assigned to trial counsel (+\$60,000); decreases to travel/training for 3 less attorneys and reduced trial colleges/lodging/meals (-\$45,093) and increase in travel/training for attorney travel time (+\$12,500); decreasing supplies and services for FY25 MAC space modification that could not be completed (-\$44,300) and increasing supplies and services to account for attorney reimbursements (+\$3000).

24. [Gratiot County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 121%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,136,955.30 as amended April 2025

Spending through Q2: 42%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,283,571.23

Regional employee MAC covers Clinton and Gratiot Counties. The MAC will track caseloads via spreadsheet and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. MAC will review attorney qualifications and will conduct bi-annual reviews. Increasing contracts for attorneys (+\$262,334) for rates and consistent with historical use/overspending & anticipated needs. Increasing experts/investigators consistent with uptick in usage (+\$22,500); decrease to supplies and services for reimbursement for FY24 overspend (-\$138,177); minor adjustments elsewhere in costs.

25. [Eaton County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 84%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,715,718.72

Spending through Q2: 36%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,962,116.81

County-based public defender office with a roster for conflict/overflow cases. Plan contemplates adding a MAC to oversee the roster. PD Office will monitor caseloads via MIDC caseload tracker, case management software, and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. MAC will track roster attorney caseloads. Assignments suspended if/when cap reached. The PD Chief/Dep will review PD's annually; when implemented, MAC will review roster attorneys annually. Increases to personnel for steps/COLAs (+\$49,349); increases to contracts for attorneys (+\$146,280) for rate changes/projected need and new conflict MAC funding; reduced experts for Poole cases (-

\$120,000); increase to supplies and services for adding CAP for the first time (+\$177,738); minor reductions to travel and training for reduction in attorneys and other adjustments to supplies and contracts consistent with projected needs.

26. [Livingston County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 88%

FY 25 approved funding: \$3,198,403.34

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$3,336,010.62

County-based public defender office oversees roster of private attorneys. PD Office to monitor caseloads via defenderData and track via spreadsheet; system will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Assignments will be suspended until attorney is under the cap. The PD Chief will evaluate qualifications upon addition to office or roster; quarterly reviews will be done by PD Chief. Personnel COLA increases only (+\$23,369); increasing contracts for attorneys (+\$101,000) consistent with rate changes, historical spending and an uptick in misdemeanor caseloads (criminal contempts/show causes); increase in travel & training due to increased mileage from PD Office move (+\$26,530); minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

Staff recommends approving the plan and a *portion* of the cost analysis, pursuant to MCL 780.993(4)³:

Mid-Michigan Region:

27. Sanilac County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 91%

FY 25 approved funding: \$671,083.05

Spending through Q2: 35%

FY 26 requested funding: \$643,196.86

FY26 recommended funding: \$642,361.65

Employee MAC handles counsel at first appearance and maintains a small docket while overseeing a roster of attorneys. The MAC will keep track of all appointments and docket coverage on the MIDC spreadsheet and will check in with surrounding systems to compare notes make sure there is an accurate count. If an attorney reaches the cap, they will be notified by email that they are temporarily unable to take new assignments. The MAC will make the initial determination of counsel's qualification according to Standard 7s tier levels. The MAC will meet with each roster attorney annually to conduct a performance review. Prior to the review, the MAC will reach out to other stakeholders to gather feedback. Any disagreements may be appeal to a neighboring system. Small COLA increase for personnel (+\$5,372.35); small decrease in contract attorney fees (-\$13,785.15) but add a line for appeals (+\$9,750); increase in rates for investigators (+\$3,250); cost

³ “(4) The MIDC shall approve or disapprove all *or any portion of* a plan or cost analysis, or both a plan and cost analysis, submitted under subsection (3), and shall do so within 90 calendar days of the submission of the plan and cost analysis. If the MIDC disapproves any part of the plan, the cost analysis, or both the plan and the cost analysis, the indigent criminal defense system shall consult with the MIDC and, for any disapproved portion, submit a new plan, a new cost analysis, or both within 60 calendar days of the mailing date of the official notification of the MIDC's disapproval. If after 3 submissions a compromise is not reached, the dispute must be resolved as provided in section 15. All approved provisions of an indigent criminal defense system's plan and cost analysis must not be delayed by any disapproved portion and must proceed as provided in this act. The MIDC shall not approve a cost analysis or portion of a cost analysis unless it is reasonably and directly related to an indigent defense function.” (emphasis added).

allocation reduced (-\$7,979.50); increase to transcripts to reflect new rates (+\$500); FY25 had a line for reimbursement for FY24 that is not needed in the upcoming fiscal year. Staff recommendation is to limit cost allocation to 10% of personnel/fringes combined (reduce - \$835.21).

South Central Region:

28. Shiawassee County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,646,602.95

Spending through Q2: 28%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,613,998.81

FY26 *recommended* funding: \$1,583,341.26

County-based public defender office with a roster of attorneys for conflicts and overflow cases. PD Office will track caseloads using MIDC-provided spreadsheet and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program; attorneys will be asked to self-report caseloads when necessary. PD Office to suspend assignments if cap is met. The PD Chief will review qualifications of attorneys and provide bi-annual evaluations. Reductions in PD staffing (remove Investigator -\$67,454); Contracts for Attorney spending (based on historical use -\$77,500); contracts/other building lease shifted to cost allocation plan (-\$20,000). Increase in Supplies for adding CAP for the first time (+\$147,349); minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis. Staff recommendation is to limit cost allocation to 10% of personnel/fringes combined (reduce -\$30,656.55).

29. [Washtenaw County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 95%

FY 25 approved funding: \$13,636,117.04

Spending through Q2: 48%

FY 26 requested funding: \$14,451,034.92

FY26 *recommended* funding: \$14,148,366.00

County-based public defender office with a MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys for conflicts and overflow cases. PD Office tracks caseloads via case management software & MAC tracks via Smartsheet; system will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. If the cap is reached, cases are assigned to other attorneys who are under the cap. PD Chief determines qualifications and conducts reviews for PD's; MAC determines qualifications and conducts reviews for roster attorneys. MAC has a Standard 7 stakeholder appeal process. Funding unit will contract an outside partner to conduct a program evaluation, including client satisfaction and other areas of training and services provided (+\$64,384). Increases for Personnel for COLA (+\$371,221) and adding 1 PD for Padilla/immigration consults to be shared with South-Central (+\$75,000); increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$172,772) based on historical use/COLA; increases to travel and training for case-related travel (+\$18,126) and to supplies and services (CAP +\$ \$384,976). Staff recommendation is to limit cost allocation to 10% of personnel/fringes combined (reduce - \$302,668.95).

Staff recommends disapproving the plan and cost analysis:

Requires Q3 spending evaluation; potential revision to plans related to caseload coverage and compensation:

Western Michigan Region:

30. Allegan County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80% (regional w/Van Buren)

FY 25 approved funding: \$4,532,342.07

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$4,640,880.99

County-based public defender office previously regionalized with Van Buren County. Mid-sized office with 12 attorneys and 11 non-attorney staff, including request for new holistic defense Tech assistant. Also includes large roster due to limited life-offense qualified in-house staff. System has worked with MIDC to personalize a caseload spreadsheet to monitor caseload limitations; roster is required to self-report non-MIDC caseloads. Chief PD selects all attorneys working in the system using interviews, court watching, reference checks, academic qualifications, and county employment protocols. Formal attorney reviews will occur will annually. Increase to personnel/fringes (+\$454,043) due largely to county-wide wage increases and PD specific increase to create parity with prosecutor's office. Significant decreases to contracts for attorneys (-\$245,246) and experts/investigators (-\$122,574) based on projected needs; minor increases elsewhere in travel/training and supplies.

31. [Van Buren County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80% (regionalized w/Allegan)

FY 25 approved funding: \$3,957,057.97

Spending through Q2: 24%

FY 26 requested funding: \$3,357,826.49

Newly-established County based public defender office; hiring is ongoing. System delivery model is new as of October 2024 with goal to continue hiring and reduce reliance on contracts for attorneys. PD utilizes defenderData and the MIDC caseload tracking spreadsheet to regularly monitor assignments; roster attorneys are responsible for reporting out-of-system assignments biannually; any attorney at limit will not be assigned new cases. PD tacks qualifications of counsel at hiring and formal reviews will occur at a minimum annually. Notably significant reductions in fringes (health insurance -\$177,668.30), contracts for attorneys (-\$243,922.00), experts/investigators (-\$71,650.00), and supplies/services (-\$87,713.56).

32. [Barry County](#)

FY24 approved funding utilized: 57%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,584,164.04

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,403,463.34

County based public defender office with 4 employees that accepts all adult indigent defense cases and manages a conflict roster. PD office will monitor all data related to MIDC standards. Caseloads are tracked on a spreadsheet; PD office is based in courthouse and assesses qualifications, conducts reviews and makes observations regularly. Formal reviews occur every three years. Increase to personnel and fringes (+\$82,938.80) related to 2 employees receiving a county pay scale upgrade; other COLAs and additional slight fringes increase for other staff. Significant decrease in contracts for attorneys (-

\$227,281.50) based on current spending and FY 25/FY 24 case trends. The system is no longer seeking \$40,000.00 in their expert request for their sole juvenile lifer case that has been resolved without need for expert funds. Minor increases in supplies/services.

33. [Cass County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 77%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,011,632.05

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,115,434.11

Small MAC system with 8 total attorneys accepting assignments. MAC will monitor caseloads with spreadsheet and communication with other counties assigning rosters cases. MAC will communicate with attorney when close to cap and stop assigning new cases at cap. MAC observes attorneys regularly and updates qualifications. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$97640) due to projected caseload needs; minor adjustments elsewhere in cost analysis.

34. [Kent County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 45%

FY 25 approved funding: \$26,022,957.23

Spending through Q2: 22%

FY 26 requested funding: \$24,464,854.79

Large county PD department with large roster and high volume, 93 total attorneys in system (43 total in-house attorneys and 30 non-attorney staff). This fiscal year has seen a significant transition from a vendor-based provider to a county department. There is an overall budget decrease as system continues transition including some one-time costs for equipment and space modification. Additional reporting will be helpful to review overall request in next fiscal year.

35. [Montcalm County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,593,680.58

Spending through Q2: 24%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,603,640.43

Small MAC with 13 roster attorneys taking cases. The MAC assigns and monitors all cases regularly, notifies an attorney if approaching case cap. Attorneys self-report outside assignments. MAC regularly reviews attorneys through courtroom observations and tracking of years/trial experience. MAC will formally review all attorneys at least annually. Neighboring Ionia County serves as an appeal partner. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$24,000) for projected needs; minor adjustments elsewhere in the cost analysis.

36. [Muskegon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 64%

FY 25 approved funding: \$8,631,598.81

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$10,251,541.84

Medium size county PD office with external MAC for conflict cases with 28 FTE employee attorneys with 4 PT positions for law school interns and 10 PT legal undergrad interns. Many attorneys in the system have less than 2 years of criminal defense experience in Michigan. System is requesting significant overall budget increase largely from personnel and fringes (+1,499,708.54) which includes requests for 10 new positions (3 attorney, 5 non-attorney, and 2 PT non-attorney); increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$82,935.20). Overall increase must be evaluated in light of additional reporting and analysis of caseloads.

Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair Region:

37. [Charter Township of Shelby](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 69%

FY 25 approved funding: \$384,012.50

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$673,284.00

The Macomb County Chief Public Defender serves as the MAC and oversees a roster of attorneys. The Macomb compliance attorney will utilize a new case management system to monitor and audit caseloads on a monthly basis. Attorneys who wish to become a roster attorney will have their qualifications reviewed as part of the approval process. The compliance attorney will assist with attorney reviews as required by Standard 7. Reviews will consist of court observation, individual attorney meetings, and reviewing files. Attorney reviews will occur once every three years, at minimum. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to a major change in the court's system comprised of one assigned judge and how the court schedules cases. The system change also reflects hourly rate increases and appeals (+\$278,147.50) which should be evaluated in light of projected needs and Q3 spending; increase to experts and investigators (+\$8,400.00) reflects increased demand and hourly rate increase for investigators, increase in supplies and services to cover costs of per page increase for transcripts (+\$2,220.00); interpreters status quo.

38. [City of Eastpointe](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 37%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,908,056.25

Spending through Q2: 19%

FY 26 requested funding: \$993,721.00

Contract MAC who oversees a roster of attorneys. The MAC tracks caseloads and is able to share caseload information with other systems

in the region. Eastpointe collaborates with the Macomb system and its new compliance attorney and other MACs in the region to eventually utilize case management software to support, Standard 6 compliance. The MAC will conduct a review of each roster attorney once every three years. The review will include, but will not be limited to, one-on-one interviews, court observation and review of any feedback from stakeholders about attorney performance. Significant reductions to contracts for attorneys (-\$908,555.25) should be evaluated against Q3 spending.

39. [City of Hazel Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,119,666.69

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,005,513.89

Contractor MAC participates in LMOS pilot project, a collaborative, regionally-based project where systems submit attorney caseloads. Hazel Park has also partnered with Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office (IDSO) to further monitor qualifications via their Standard 6 & 7 Compliance Attorney, on a regional basis to ensure attorneys stay below the cap. The MAC also monitors attorney caseloads and confirms that attorneys on the roster are qualified to take assignments under Standard 7. New Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office (IDSO) Std. 6/7 Compliance Attorney reviews and observes MIDC attorneys every three years. Compliance attorney sends reports to MAC and any, and all, concerns are followed up by the MAC. Slight increase to personnel per local contract (+\$8,401.20) and supplies/services (+\$38,585.00) due to system budgeting for booths to accommodate the need for more confidential meeting space; decrease to contracts for attorneys reflect budget reduction (-\$161,815.00).

40. [City of Madison Heights](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 70%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$705,333.37
Spending through Q2: 35%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$630,629.67

Contract MAC office overseeing a roster of 32 attorneys. New Oakland County IDSO Compliance Attorney via interlocal agreement will track attorney caseloads. The MAC will also track attorney caseload, reviewing monthly and quarterly updates, and the MAC will contact attorneys with high volume of cases to ensure they remain below their year-to-date cap. MAC reviews prospective roster attorney CVs and has thorough discussions with them on their background, criminal defense history, experiences, and current legal work. MAC explains MIDC requirements and standards prior to accepting them onto roster. MAC regularly sends out emails to all attorneys regarding the current and newly implemented standards, as well as important updates and CLE courses to attend. One-on-one conversations between the MAC and attorneys also occur regularly and as needed. Additionally, the Oakland County Indigent Defense Services Office has a compliance attorney who reviews and observes MIDC attorneys every three years, via interlocal agreement. Compliance attorney sends her reports to MAC. All concerns are followed up by the MAC. Contracts for attorneys to reflect new hourly rate (-\$77,023.00) and reduced hours.

41. [City of Pontiac](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 36%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$1,319,413.18
Spending through Q2: 24%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$727,332.03

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of 24 attorneys. Attorney caseloads will be monitored through its internal database and participation in the LMOS pilot project. Attorneys will be notified via email if they have

reached their caseload cap. For Standard 7 qualifications to roster, applicant attorneys are required to answer questions that mirror Standard 7 qualifications, to decide eligibility. For current attorneys, MIDC executive sends a survey to determine how many attorneys meet the Standard 7 qualifications applicable to their current category; qualification level is determined by the MAC. Review of counsel occurs via interlocal agreement w/Oakland County IDSO, whose Standard 6/7 Compliance Attorney will review 1/3 of the total number of attorneys on its criminal appointment list, every three using a detailed 5-step process. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$593,583.60) should continue to be evaluated.

42. [City of Roseville](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 54%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,642,355.02

Spending through Q2: 38%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,563,926.65

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Roseville opted into a regional plan for compliance with Standards 6 and 7, by way of collaborating with a compliance attorney under the Macomb County plan. The new compliance attorney will gather, track, process and report caseload data. Increase to personnel per local contract (+\$30,428.65); decrease to contracts for attorneys despite increased hourly rates (-\$73,055.00).

43. [City of Royal Oak](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 76%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,224,425.00

Spending through Q2: 36%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,092,324.00

Contract MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and works in conjunction with a funding unit employee (MIDC Project Manager) who assists with

Standards 6 and 7. They will be implementing case management software which will allow reports with criteria to track assignments, caseloads, and hours more accurately and efficiently. Software criteria will be set to flag warnings for roster attorneys approaching Standard 6 maximums. As a precaution, monthly reports will be monitored by the Project Director and information relayed to the MAC. If a roster attorney reaches the 70% range, new assignments will be paused and the roster attorney informed of the pause by the MAC. The project director will monitor these attorneys weekly and inform the MAC when they can begin receiving new assignments immediately. Royal Oak has entered into a 5-year Interlocal Agreement with Oakland County to have its Indigent Defense Services Office provide qualification monitoring and review for attorneys working in both the Oakland County and Royal Oak indigent programs via the newly hired compliance attorney. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$148,416.00).

44. [City of Sterling Heights](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 61%

FY 25 approved funding: \$602,875.00

Spending through Q2: 59%

FY 26 requested funding: \$656,375.00

Contract MAC oversees a roster of attorneys; system will continue to collaborate with the Macomb County Office of the Public Defender system and use the services of the Macomb compliance attorney on a monthly basis. System participates in monthly LMOS Pilot Project by submitting attorney caseload data to assist with regional collaboration on caseload tracking. Compliance attorney will conduct formal attorney reviews every three years, but reviews may occur more often as needed. Contracts for attorneys increased (+\$51,250.00) and experts/investigators increased (+\$2,500.00) based on projected needs.

45. [City of Warren](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 32%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,159,618.97

Spending through Q2: 28%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,318,147.13

Contractor MAC utilizes a spreadsheet to track attorney caseloads. Attorneys will be notified when approaching their caseload cap. The MAC office will collaborate with other MACs in the Macomb region to track case assignments from other jurisdictions. Attorneys who wish to join the roster undergo an assessment by the MAC to determine eligibility based on qualification level. Currently, the MAC engages in court watching each quarter to review counsel. System opted in to the Macomb regional plan for compliance with Standards 6 and 7. No increase to personnel or supplies/services; significant decrease to contracts for attorneys includes hourly rate increase; increase to MAC hours (-\$842,221.84).

46. [Lapeer County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,173,295.00

Spending through Q2: 45%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,297,080.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys. Assignment data collected on 365-day rolling basis, i.e. case (or docket hours) "falls off" of an attorney's caseload on the 366th day after the appointment is made. Database give warnings as attorneys approach caseload maximum; system can generate report at any time to determine current caseload percentages; information about assignments in other jurisdictions is collected and participates in LMOS pilot project. MAC annually reviews qualifications and performance of all roster attorneys and includes a self-assessment and input from system stakeholders. The increase to contracts for attorneys is (+\$66,520.00) based on

projected needs; increase for experts/investigators for high profile murder case (+\$54,500).

47. Macomb County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 41%

FY 25 approved funding: \$16,710,883.38

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$14,402,636.39

County-based public defender office accepting 20-25% of assignments with the Chief Public Defender overseeing a roster of attorneys accepting the remaining cases. To monitor and audit caseloads, Macomb will acquire new software and hire a compliance attorney. The compliance attorney will compile, report, monitor and audit caseloads both in the Macomb funding unit and in other Macomb County funding units. Attorneys who apply to become a roster attorney in Macomb will have their qualifications reviewed for the different levels of cases. The Compliance Attorney will develop and employ a system of review for both roster attorneys and public defender employee attorneys. Attorney reviews will be conducted once every three years at minimum. Increase to personnel/fringes and staffing at PD office (+\$457,239.25); decrease to contracts for attorneys due to increased reliance on PD office and budget reduction (-\$2,522,467.38); decrease to experts and investigators based on actual use (-\$199,000.00); decrease to contracts other to reflect costs associated with case management software (-\$156,970.16); adjustments/ slight increases to all other categories.

48. Oakland County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$22,360,689.74

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$23,108,885.37

County-based public defender office accepting approximately 20% of cases; county-based MAC office overseeing roster of attorneys accepting 80% of cases. The IDSO office expanded, boosting the overall number of roster attorneys from 193 to 204. The total number of IDSO staff attorneys also increased by five (+5) new staff attorney positions, which include the addition of two Senior Public Defenders (+2) one to supervise felonies, the other to supervise misdemeanors; plus three (+3) assistant public defenders and two Law Clerk Interns. Oakland has an attorney (employee) who is responsible for managing the compliance with Standards 6 and 7. The system is also communicating with the third-class district courts in Oakland County and has entered into inter-local agreements to have the designated IDSO attorney employee manage their Standard 6 and 7 compliance. The compliance attorney-employee uses a combination of the internal appointment database as well as spreadsheet templates provided by the MIDC to track compliance with Standard. As a result of the first Lapeer Macomb Oakland, St. Clair County (LMOS) Regional Conference held on January 16, 2025, Oakland County also participates in the regional LMOS Pilot Project to track caseloads and compliance on a monthly basis. Attorneys self-report caseloads for work in other systems and attorney employee will confirm with MACs in the Oakland region. New attorneys wishing to join the roster will complete an application that is utilized as a screening tool for attorney qualifications. Oakland County will implement a new 5-step review process to review 1/3 of attorneys on list with a built-in appeal process to handle disputes. Current attorneys are also surveyed as to their qualifications. Attorneys will be evaluated by the new Standard 6 & Compliance Attorney through in-court monitoring, attorney consultation, and surveys to stakeholders. IDSO Chief ultimately

determines attorney qualifications. Increase to personnel due to PD office growth/COLA (+\$1,098,722.89); overall decrease to contractual attorneys due to PD office growth (-\$634,000); increase to experts & investigators (+\$112,000) based on projected needs. Adjustments in other cost categories consistent with staffing and projected spending.

Mid-Michigan Region:

49. Iosco County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 101%

FY 25 approved funding: \$646,195.92

Spending through Q2: 42%

FY 26 requested funding: \$686,914.82

Contractor MAC oversees roster of attorneys. Assignments are tracked using Clio spreadsheet and reviewed regularly (at least quarterly). If an attorney exceeds, assignments will be paused until caseload drops. MAC will consult with surrounding systems regularly to monitor attorneys in multiple systems. New attorneys will be evaluated consistent with MIDC Standards and a decision as to qualifications can be appealed to neighboring MAC. Lead Attorney meets with Roster attorneys once a year to evaluate and discuss any issues with representation. Increase to attorney contracts (+\$21,697.74); increase in expected expert/investigator rates and hours (+\$18,375); minor increase to training/travel. System is projecting overspending in FY2025 which will be evaluated after additional reporting is submitted.

Northern MI Region:

50. [Antrim County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 73%

FY 25 approved funding: \$610,194.60

Spending through Q2: 39%

FY 26 requested funding: \$529,356.00

Contracted MAC office overseeing a roster of attorneys, regionalized with Grand Traverse and Leelanau Counties; caseloads are monitored through CLIO case management system; attorneys will be notified when they are getting close to the caseload cap, and again when they reach the cap; when an attorney's cap is reached, they will not be assigned new cases. Reviews are conducted annually by MAC to determine qualification level and provide feedback. Reviews include meeting with attorney, feedback from court personnel, court observation, and review of attorney invoices. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$83,147) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 and FY25 reporting; addition of \$1,500 for regional MIDC conference.

51. [Leelanau County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 91%

FY 25 approved funding: \$369,376.60

Spending through Q2: 53%

FY 26 requested funding: \$424,248.00

Contracted MAC office overseeing a roster of attorneys, regionalized with Grand Traverse and Antrim Counties; caseloads are monitored through CLIO case management system; attorneys will be notified when they are getting close to the caseload cap, and again when they reach the cap; when an attorney's cap is reached, they will not be assigned new cases. Reviews are conducted annually by MAC to determine qualification level and provide feedback. Reviews include meeting with attorney, feedback from court personnel, court observation, and review

of attorney invoices. Increase in contracts for attorneys (+\$54,970) through tailoring of hours based on FY25 reporting and current spending.

52. [Dickinson County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 71%

FY 25 approved funding: \$560,375.87

Spending through Q2: 46%

FY 26 requested funding: \$538,974.40

Contractor MAC tracks cases assigned through excel spreadsheets. If attorney meets cap they are notified in writing and not assigned cases until they are under the cap. Attorneys self-report monthly case numbers from other funding units. MAC tracks qualification level via excel spreadsheet and evaluates each attorneys' qualifications based on attorney self-report of criminal defense experience, jury trials, and training. MAC notifies attorney of qualification level. Any attorney appeal is sent to Iron Defense. MAC privately meets with each attorney annually for review and assessment of any concerns. Decrease contracts for attorneys (-\$43,133.47); increase to expert and investigators (+\$7,000) for increased investigator hourly rates and increased usage; increase to training and travel (+\$14,880) for case related travel.

53. [Emmet County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,067,722.62

Spending through Q2: 29%

FY 26 requested funding: \$679,661.40

Contractor MAC overseeing a consortium of attorneys paid hourly. Attorney administrator tracks caseloads using caseload tracking spreadsheet, CLIO, and reports provided by the court to ensure there is a balance in appointments for the consortium attorneys. When an attorney reaches half of their cap, they meet with the MAC to discuss a

plan for the remainder of the year. Once cap is met the attorney is not assigned new cases until they are below the cap. Attorneys self-report outside appointments. MAC assesses qualification level, reviews will be conducted annually using self-assessment, stakeholder feedback, and meeting with attorney to determine qualification level. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$394,905.22); addition of \$3,440 for case related travel time and mileage.

54. [Gogebic County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%

FY 25 approved funding: \$578,413.98

Spending through Q2: 37%

FY 26 requested funding: \$601,048.36

Contractor MAC oversees roster in this and Ontonagon County. MAC Administrator tracks assignments to ensure attorneys do not exceed caseload caps; communicates with attorneys when reaching cap and coordinates with neighboring counties about caseloads. Attorneys self-report years of practice, jury trials, criminal defense experience, and training to MAC admin. Stakeholder committee determines qualification level based on information reported by attorneys and review of counsel conducted by MAC; appeal process in place. MAC will conduct annual reviews of attorneys. MAC will observe them in court, meet with attorney, interview stakeholders. Committee of stakeholders will participate in process. Surveys of stakeholders or clients will be discussed by the committee. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$18,050) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; addition of CAFA on-call (\$33,800) for 5 days per week at \$130; addition of \$26,880 for case related travel time and mileage.

55. [Ontonagon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 53%

FY 25 approved funding: \$209,937.73

Spending through Q2: 24%

FY 26 requested funding: \$206,067.73

Contractor MAC oversees roster in this and Gogebic County. MAC Administrator tracks assignments to ensure attorneys do not exceed caseload caps; communicates with attorneys when reaching cap and coordinates with neighboring counties about caseloads. Attorneys self-report years of practice, jury trials, criminal defense experience, and training to MAC admin. MAC committee determines qualification level based on information reported by attorneys and review of counsel conducted by MAC; appeal process in place. MAC receives experience levels from roster attorneys and determines qualification in accordance with MIDC standard. Attorney appeals are heard by stakeholders committee. Judges on committee may participate but not vote. MAC reviews attorneys annually by meeting with stakeholders and sitting in on cases. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$22,450) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; addition of CAFA on-call (\$33,800) for 5 days per week at \$130; addition of \$26,880 for case related travel time and mileage.

56. [Kalkaska County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 55%

FY 25 approved funding: \$604,738.22

Spending through Q2: 53%

FY 26 requested funding: \$938,988.49

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys tracks assignments and will use CMS; if an attorney reaches their cap the assignments will be given to alternate counsel. Attorneys will self-report cases from other systems quarterly and MAC will verify with surrounding MACs. All current attorneys are qualified to accept life-eligible offenses; new

attorneys would be assessed by MAC using guidance and requirements from MIDC and qualification appeals will be heard by a neighboring MAC. Attorneys are reviewed in person annually at the end of each fiscal year by the MAC. Increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$315,150) requires evaluation of additional spending.

57. [Luce County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 84%

FY 25 approved funding: \$382,161.00

Spending through Q2: 29%

FY 26 requested funding: \$408,162.50

Contractor MAC oversees roster and also serves as the MAC in Mackinac County. MAC tracks cases assigned within Luce and Mackinac County using ZLS. Roster attorneys accepting cases in other jurisdictions self-report case assignments quarterly, and these are verified by administrators in adjoining jurisdictions. If an attorney reaches the caseload cap they are notified and not assigned cases until they are under the cap. MAC will conduct yearly review of all attorneys using a scoring/review sheet. MAC reviewed by an adjoining MAC yearly. Increase in contracts for attorneys for increased rates and addition of mental health court and appeals representation (+\$13,248); Increase in training/travel for addition of travel time – client visits (+\$13,309.50); overall increase from FY25 of \$26,001.50.

58. [Mackinac County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$519,911.00

Spending through Q2: 31%

FY 26 requested funding: \$550,901.00

Contractor MAC oversees roster and also serves as the MAC in Luce County. MAC tracks caseloads using case management software, roster attorneys required to self-report caseloads quarterly; attorneys who

exceed caseload limit in any rolling year are notified and no longer assigned until the defect is cured. Caseload disputes can be appealed to a MAC or PD in a different county. Yearly reviews are conducted by the Grant Administrator (attorney) focusing on attorney performance, qualifications, client relationships, communications, organization, advocacy, professionalism, interaction with the criminal justice system and compliance with MIDC standards when assessing qualification level. Annual reviews include feedback from stakeholders, attorney observation, and meeting with the attorney. Increase in contracts for attorneys for increased rates and addition of mental health court and appeals representation (+\$15,578); Increase in training/travel for addition of travel time – client visits (+\$19,968).

59. [Otsego County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$994,234.07

Spending through Q2: 26%

FY 26 requested funding: \$802,076.87

Contractor MAC oversees roster of attorneys; office maintains spreadsheet to track caseloads which is updated quarterly; attorneys are notified in writing if cap is met, attorneys self-report cases in other systems quarterly. Qualification is determined by contracted defense attorney based on resume submitted by attorney; appeals resolved by attorney administrator. Attorney administrator will review attorneys at least once every three years. Attorneys with less than five years of experience evaluated once per year. Decrease in contracts for attorneys (-\$212,137.50) through tailoring of hours based on FY24 reporting; Addition of case management software (+\$8,640); Addition of \$9,920 for case related travel time.

Wayne County Region:

Many Wayne County Third Class District Courts are part of a Regionalized Managed Assigned Counsel System (RMACO) based in the City of Dearborn which oversees compliance related to the MIDC's standards.

60. [Canton Township](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 109%

FY 25 approved funding: \$423,150.00

Spending through Q2: 36%

FY 26 requested funding: \$450,190.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to an increase in the hourly rate and additional attorney added to docket day schedule (+\$69,040); last year the system was reimbursed for overspending on direct services which is not repeated here (-\$42,000).

61. [City of Allen Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$265,477.45

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$244,429.75

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to COLA for personnel (+\$792.30), increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$21,840).

62. [City of Dearborn](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 92%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,663,406.66

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,845,153.60

Third class district court where RMACO is based with personnel for administration and a roster of contracted attorneys providing services. MAC will oversee compliance with MIDC standards for 19 district and municipal courts in Wayne County. The MAC uses a case management system to track assignments and audits caseloads monthly, and will also gather information from attorneys about outside assignments. The MAC determines qualification levels of roster attorneys and will review attorneys annually with a process that includes court watching and feedback from system stakeholders. Increase to personnel/fringes for COLA (+\$50,145); increase to contracts for attorneys for increased rate and hours for docket coverage (+\$58,910); increase to experts/investigators (+\$44,841) for projected needs; increase to contracts/other (+\$14,650) for the office lease; increase to training/travel (+\$16,912) for personnel and roster; and increase to supplies/services (+\$28,660) for office needs.

63. [City of Garden City](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80%

FY 25 approved funding: \$156,871.85

Spending through Q2: 47%

FY 26 requested funding: \$161,871.43

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to personnel/COLA (+\$3,209.58), overall increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$1,790.00) due to an increase in the hourly rate but a decrease in docket hours.

64. [City of Grosse Pointe](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 57%

FY 25 approved funding: \$21,168.00

Spending through Q2: 21%

FY 26 requested funding: \$14,178.06

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$6,989.94).

65. [City of Grosse Pointe Farms](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 63%

FY 25 approved funding: \$88,440.03

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$61,097.66

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$27,342.37).

66. [City of Grosse Pointe Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 49%

FY 25 approved funding: \$31,122.00

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$26,082.03

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$5039.97).

67. [City of Hamtramck](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 99%

FY 25 approved funding: \$157,531.50

Spending through Q2: 29%

FY 26 requested funding: \$162,532.50

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys (+\$5,004) but no change in hours.

68. [City of Highland Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$115,189.61

Spending through Q2: 32%

FY 26 requested funding: \$134,824.93

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to personnel/COLA (+\$1,400.50), increase to contracts for attorneys (+\$18,234.82) due to an increase in the hourly rate and docket hours.

69. [City of Inkster](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 117%

FY 25 approved funding: \$153,640.00

Spending through Q2: 56%

FY 26 requested funding: \$180,302.98

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to contracts for attorneys due to an increase in the hourly rate and hours (+\$31,600); last year the system was reimbursed for overspending on direct services and a reduced request is included here for the reimbursement (-\$5,062.98).

70. [City of Romulus](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 78%

FY 25 approved funding: \$302,667.20

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$267,791.20

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$34,876).

71. [City of Southgate](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 76%

FY 25 approved funding: \$200,340.00

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$183,300.00

Third class district court participates in RMACO. Increase to rates for contracts for attorneys but overall reduction in hours based on projections (-\$17,040).

72. [City of Detroit](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 119%

FY 25 approved funding: \$6,116,046.59

Spending through Q2: 38%

FY 26 requested funding: \$7,665,699.93

Employee co-MACs oversee a roster of attorneys providing services in an extremely busy district court. Manual system for tracking caseloads will be replaced with ZLS case management software in FY26. Qualification to be added to the roster includes a mentorship program; attorneys will be reviewed on an annual basis. The plan for reviews includes a checklist covering court observations, client feedback, and compliance with the MIDC's standards. Increase to personnel/fringes for COLA and a second administrative assistant (+\$170,127.27); increase

to contracts for attorneys for rate increase and increase in hours (+\$1,238,515) based on projected needs; increase to experts/investigators (+\$145,000) which should be evaluated in light of spending; other contracts (+\$40,200) for case management system; overall supplies/services decreased but there is a need for reimbursement for overspending to be addressed after quarterly spending is evaluated.

South Central Region:

73. Genesee County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 30%

FY 25 approved funding: \$17,308,519.15

Spending through Q2: 22%

FY 26 requested funding: \$12,630,852.78

County-based public defender office also oversees a roster of private attorneys. Caseloads will be monitored via spreadsheet/MIDC caseload tracker and roster attorneys will self-report outside assignments. System will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Assignments will be suspended if an attorney reaches the cap. Chief PD reviews qualifications upon hiring and addition to roster, with MAC input. Annual evaluations provided to newer attorneys; bi-annual evaluations provided for established attorneys. Adjustments to personnel/fringes including salaries/COLA (+\$152,290); significant reduction to contracts for attorneys (-\$4,124,899) based on historical use and projected need; reductions to experts for resolved Poole/Parks cases (-\$860,000); increases to contracts/other for software increases and adding new digital evidence software to streamline discovery from the prosecutor (+\$72,000); increases to travel and training for case-related travel costs, some increased training meals/lodging, mileage and support staff training (+\$29,511); supplies and services increase for CAP (+\$21,066) and

transcripts (+\$12,000) plus other minor adjustments elsewhere in costs.

74. [Hillsdale County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 47%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,031,564.53

Spending through Q2: 29%

FY 26 requested funding: \$726,663.08

Contractor MAC accepts cases and oversees a roster of private attorneys. MAC will monitor caseloads and will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Attorneys will be suspended from assignments if cap is reached. The MAC determines attorney qualifications upon application to the roster and will provide annual written evaluations to attorneys. Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$291,620) based on use and projected needs; decrease to experts and investigators (-\$25,000) based on use. Adding case-related travel costs to travel & training (+\$1800). Minor adjustments elsewhere in costs.

75. [Ingham County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 96%

FY 25 approved funding: \$11,625,284.60

Spending through Q2: 35%

FY 26 requested funding: \$11,255,091.27

County-based public defender office with a roster for conflict/overflow cases. System plan contemplates adding a MAC to oversee the roster. The PD Office will monitor caseloads via MIDC tracker (rolling year) spreadsheet; when implemented, the MAC will monitor roster caseloads. System will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Attorneys will be suspended from assignments if cap is reached. The PD Chief determines qualifications and reviews PD attorneys annually; when implemented, the MAC will determine

qualifications and review roster attorneys. Increasing personnel for COLA & re-class 1 position (+\$206,034). Reduce contracts for attorneys based on projected needs & add MAC (-\$327,758). Decrease experts/investigators for Poole cases and minor increase for Investigator rates (-\$236,850); increase to other/contracts for new building lease (+\$68,111); decrease to supplies and services related to completion of office move (-\$111,108 - new furniture); other adjustments to equipment, training/travel and supplies/services based on staffing needs and anticipated use.

76. [Lenawee County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 68%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,773,097.86

Spending through Q2: 38%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,683,847.13

County-based public defender office with a MAC for conflicts and overflow assignments. System will use MIDC caseload tracker spreadsheet to track caseloads and MAC will track roster cases; PD will monitor monthly; will suspend assignments if cap is met and MAC will do the same with contract counsel. System will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program. Reviews of counsel are done annually. Personnel increase for COLA only (+\$17,842). Decrease to contracts for attorneys (-\$37,373) based on historical use; decreases to experts/investigators based on use and removal of juvenile life case (-\$65,000); minor adjustments to other categories.

Revisions to plans required:

NOTE: For all systems listed below, the requested funding has been preliminarily analyzed by the Regional Manager and Grants Director, and will be reevaluated after revisions to plans are made and up-to-date spending projections for individual systems are considered.

Western Michigan Region:

77. [Calhoun County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 89%

FY 25 approved funding: \$7,974,499.70

Spending through Q2: 36%

FY 26 requested funding: \$10,040,017.64

Large county public defender office with 38 system attorneys. Current submission includes request for 18 FTE PD attorney positions, 17 FTE non-attorney positions, and 6 PT non-attorney positions; anticipates a shift reducing 4 FTE PD positions from prior FY 25 request and significantly increases budget for contracts for attorneys. Funding unit has requested an opportunity to revise the FY26 compliance plan.

78. [Kalamazoo County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 93%

FY 25 approved funding: \$10,090,262.32

Spending through Q2: 47%

FY 26 requested funding: \$13,633,065.34

Large non-profit defender office model with a conflict MAC. Clarification is required as to MAC role in assignments and tracking requests for experts/investigators. Significant increase in staff requested (+15 FTEs) that is not supported by caseload projections at this time. Increase in ancillary spending requires supporting documentation.

79. [St. Joseph County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 90%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,103,983.67

Spending through Q2: 51%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,266,616.17

Part-time employee MAC oversees a small roster of attorneys. Additional information is needed to analyze attorney payments for “duty weeks” and supporting documentation is required for confidential space modification.

*Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair Region:*80. [City of Farmington](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 71%

FY 25 approved funding: \$787,500.00

Spending through Q2: 42%

FY 26 requested funding: \$563,097.86

Contractor co-MACs oversee roster of attorneys. This system now screens for indigency as the appointing authority and implemented an appeal process for any denials. The system also opted in to the Oakland Co. St. 6 & 7 staff attorney to facilitate compliance with these standards. MACs created an Excel database to track caseloads. MACs also rely on the MIDCs LMOS Pilot Program to enter and track monthly caseload statistics across the region. Request for additional (potentially duplicative) funding for caseload data collection requires clarification.

81. [City of Ferndale](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%

FY 25 approved funding: \$788,516.35

Spending through Q2: 29%

FY 26 requested funding: \$674,178.79

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Ferndale opted into a regional management plan with Oakland County to achieve compliance with Standards 6 and 7. Request for additional (potentially duplicative) funding for caseload data collection requires clarification.

82. [City of Oak Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 77%

FY 25 approved funding: \$643,625.00

Spending through Q2: 40%

FY 26 requested funding: \$489,849.98

Fulltime MAC and one part-time contract co-MAC oversee a roster of attorneys. MACs created Excel database to enter the number of assigned misdemeanor cases for each MIDC roster attorney. Oak Park partnered with the Oakland County IDSO system to transition attorney caseload monitoring to the IDSO Standard 6/7 compliance attorney. MACs participate in LMOS monthly caseload pilot project to coordinate with other regional MACs to obtain caseload information from other systems. Request for additional (potentially duplicative) funding for caseload data collection requires clarification.

83. [City of Southfield](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 51%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,230,865.00

Spending through Q2: 28%

FY 26 requested funding: \$903,223.00

Contract MAC who oversees a roster of attorneys. Southfield partnered with the Oakland County system to utilize the attorney employee to implement compliance with Standards 6 and 7. Hourly rates must be increased to meet Standard 8. The process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units is incomplete.

84. [Clinton Township](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 56%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,069,931.25

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$907,467.00

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys will total cases and maintain on a spreadsheet; MAC also working on joining with the Macomb PD office's efforts to monitor cases countywide. MAC responsible for monitoring and auditing caseload calculations. Macomb County PD compliance attorney will oversee the process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units. Once caseload cap reached, no further cases will be assigned for the year. Additional detail is required to evaluate plan for qualification and review of counsel.

*Mid-Michigan Region:*85. [Clare and Gladwin Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,200,000.01

Spending through Q2: 28%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,316,702.31

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and monitors compliance for Clare, Gladwin, Lake, Mason, Mecosta, Newaygo, Oceana, and Osceola Counties. The compliance plan addressing independence from the judiciary and other standards must establish a review/dispute resolution process outside of MIDC Staff; caseload cap communication to the roster and the process for qualification of counsel requires more detail.

86. [Lake County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 43%

FY 25 approved funding: \$577,886.00

Spending through Q2: 40%

FY 26 requested funding: \$594,153.44

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

87. [Mason County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,091,301.21

Spending through Q2: 38%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,180,780.58

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

88. [Mecosta County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 59%
FY 25 approved funding: \$1,381,789.76
Spending through Q2: 28%
FY 26 requested funding: \$835,866.05

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

89. [Newaygo County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%
FY 25 approved funding: \$1,341,720.70
Spending through Q2: 30%
FY 26 requested funding: \$1,166,481.98

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

90. [Oceana County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%
FY 25 approved funding: \$853,168.31
Spending through Q2: 39%
FY 26 requested funding: \$843,105.05

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

91. [Osceola County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 35%
FY 25 approved funding: \$700,000.00
Spending through Q2: 17%
FY 26 requested funding: \$544,039.21

See Clare and Gladwin, above.

92. [Alpena County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 80%
FY 25 approved funding: \$1,156,945.92
Spending through Q2: 43%
FY 26 requested funding: \$1,201,150.59

Vendor-based public defender office works regionally to also cover Montmorency and Oscoda Counties. Process for monitoring caseloads of roster attorneys is insufficient to ensure compliance; additional information about review of counsel is required.

93. [Montmorency County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%
FY 25 approved funding: \$462,608.92
Spending through Q2: 43%
FY 26 requested funding: \$467,599.71

See Alpena, above.

94. [Oscoda County](#)
FY 24 approved funding utilized: 97%
FY 25 approved funding: \$549,071.15
Spending through Q2: 45%
FY 26 requested funding: \$567,579.51

See Alpena, above.

95. [Alcona County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 67%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$299,642.74
Spending through Q2: 31%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$314,418.74

MAC contractor oversees a roster of contract attorneys; updates required to reflect implementation of caseload, qualification, and review standards to assess requests for next year.

96. [Arenac County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 79%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$567,013.79
Spending through Q2: 51%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$657,656.45

Part time contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys. The process to gather information about an attorney's caseload or assignments from other funding units is incomplete; additional information about review of counsel is required.

97. [Bay County](#)
 FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%
 FY 25 approved funding: \$2,431,107.73
Spending through Q2: 44%
 FY 26 requested funding: \$2,938,573.81

County has two public defender offices and a conflict MAC administrator overseeing a roster accepting conflict cases and contracting out arraignments in district and circuit court. Financial reporting errors recently discovered requires a hold for further evaluation after corrections.

98. [Huron County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 102%

FY 25 approved funding: \$935,576.00

Spending through Q2: 41%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,156,084.07

MAC contractor overseeing roster of attorneys. Significant additional details is required to analyze caseload, qualification, and review standards.

99. [Isabella County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 88%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,942,924.58

Spending through Q2: 44%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,334,198.71

Public defender office (county employees) with a managed assigned counsel administrator overseeing roster of attorneys. Request for two new full time corrections officers requires supporting documentation and further analysis.

100. [Ogemaw County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 50%

FY 25 approved funding: \$791,003.00

Spending through Q2: 23%

FY 26 requested funding: \$699,990.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and also serves as the administrator in Roscommon County. Process for monitoring outside caseloads, assessing qualifications of attorneys, and documenting review of counsel is required. Indigency screening standard has inconsistent answers for appointments and oversight.

101. [Roscommon County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 66%

FY 25 approved funding: \$803,777.00

Spending through Q2: 46%

FY 26 requested funding: \$833,015.00

Contractor MAC oversees a roster of attorneys and also serves as the administrator in Ogemaw County. Process for monitoring outside caseloads, assessing qualifications of attorneys, and documenting review of counsel is required. Indigency screening standard has inconsistent answers for appointments and oversight.

102. [Saginaw County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 78%

FY 25 approved funding: \$9,072,635.86

Spending through Q2: 30%

FY 26 requested funding: \$8,941,082.41

Vendor-model public defender office and contract MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys sharing the caseload. Additional information is required for counsel at first appearance in prison cases; clarification needed as to caseload tracking process.

103. [Tuscola County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 92%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,406,226.80

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,223,773.83

Fulltime time employee MAC with staff attorney cover CAFA and small docket while overseeing a roster of contract attorneys. Clarification is needed as to process for roster requesting and using investigator services and how challenges are resolved under the independence from the judiciary standard.

*Northern MI Region:*104. [Cheboygan County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 62%

FY 25 approved funding: \$937,536.52

*Spending through Q1: 20%****Spending through Q2: unknown/no submission***

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,340,333.52

County-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

105. [Houghton, Baraga, and Keweenaw Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 81%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,245,514.92

*Spending through Q1: 18%****Spending through Q2: unknown/no submission***

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,405,131.32

Vendor-based public defender office with a MAC overseeing a roster handling conflicts/overflow. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

106. [Presque Isle County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 42%

FY 25 approved funding: \$259,051.88

Spending through Q1, Q2: unknown/none submitted

FY 26 requested funding: \$271,212.36

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Reporting must be submitted to properly assess plan and costs.

107. [Alger County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 87%

FY 25 approved funding: \$599,233.50

Spending through Q2: 30%

FY 26 requested funding: \$647,372.32

County based public defender office; clarification is required for MAC position, methods of payment, and caseload tracking for roster attorneys.

108. [Charlevoix County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 60%

FY 25 approved funding: \$905,424.95

Spending through Q2: 43%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,074,309.37

Employee-based MAC system overseeing roster of attorneys. MAC tracks cases on a spreadsheet and is considering case management in FY26, attorneys are notified via email if they reach their cap and attorneys report assignments in other funding units monthly. Clarification is required as to training plan for attorneys with less than 2 years of experience; incomplete information was submitted for qualification/review standard for analysis.

109. [Chippewa County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 69%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,225,290.11

Spending through Q2: 23%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,419,165.11

County-based public defender office with a contractor MAC for conflict cases. Clarification is required about initial interviews and confidential meeting spaces, payment rates for contractors, and how challenges are resolved under the independence from the judiciary standard.

110. [Crawford County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 74%

FY 25 approved funding: \$600,712.79

Spending through Q2: 31%

FY 26 requested funding: \$512,775.97

Contractor MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Additional information is required to assess caseload monitoring, how attorneys are selected for the roster, and how reviews are documented.

111. [Delta County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 96%

FY 25 approved funding: \$888,926.70

Spending through Q2: 33%

FY 26 requested funding: \$1,031,385.96

Contractor-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Information supplied for the standard requiring independence from the judiciary is not compliant as it involves the court and/or non-attorney reviews.

112. [Iron County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 53%

FY 25 approved funding: \$782,679.59

Spending through Q2: 35%

FY 26 requested funding: \$705,519.59

Vendor-based public defender office and MAC for conflict cases. Detail is required regarding the review process for attorneys.

113. [Marquette County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 63%

FY 25 approved funding: \$2,880,689.27

Spending through Q2: 28%

FY 26 requested funding: \$3,223,574.66

County-based public defender office with a roster of attorneys for conflicts and overflow. Conflict MAC administrator responsibilities must be detailed in the plan and specifically in relation to process for compliance with the standards.

114. [Menominee County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 60%

FY 25 approved funding: \$741,995.22

Spending through Q2: 27%

FY 26 requested funding: \$745,668.16

Contractor-based MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. Process for monitoring caseloads is incomplete and plan for reviewing counsel is noncompliant with the MIDC standard. Clarification as to attorney payment methods is required.

115. [Wexford and Missaukee Counties](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 82%

FY 25 approved funding: \$1,977,431.35

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$2,571,612.78

County-based regional public defender office with a MAC overseeing a roster of attorneys. The process for determining attorney qualifications is not addressed in the compliance plan.

Wayne County Region:

116. [City of Lincoln Park](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 96%

FY 25 approved funding: \$380,202.07

Spending through Q2: 34%

FY 26 requested funding: \$369,644.50

Part-time employee MAC oversees a small roster of assigned attorneys using a largely house counsel model. MAC uses a case management system to track assignments and ensure attorneys do not exceed annual hours. Clarification is required as to the review process for attorney performance.

117. [Wayne County](#)

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 52%

FY 25 approved funding: \$54,848,724.22

Spending through Q2: 21%

FY 26 requested funding: \$47,483,273.29

County-based Managed Assigned Counsel Office overseeing a roster of attorneys taking 65% of cases; vendor-based office takes 35% of cases; FY26 plan proposes increasing the defender office capacity and decreasing reliance on the roster to 50% each. Plan requires clarification on all standards as to vendor office compliance with all MIDC Standards; confidential meeting space descriptions should be updated to match recent space modifications; Standard 4 must be addressed as to the felony/state docket assignment process in every district court; an appeal process related to selection and payment issues must be established; a timeframe for attorney payments must be included in the compliance plan.

South Central Region:

118. Jackson County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 82%

FY 25 approved funding: \$4,998,037.12

Spending through Q2: 43%

FY 26 requested funding: \$5,926,158.72

County-based public defender office with a roster for conflict/overflow cases. System plan contemplates adding a MAC to oversee the roster. A Compliance Analyst will monitor PD caseloads and system will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program; MAC will track and monitor roster caseloads. Assignments will be suspended if caps are reached. Chief PD determines qualifications and annually reviews PD's; MAC will determine qualifications and annually review roster attorneys. Increases in staffing in PD office to add 3 PD's & 1 Admin Asst for data collection/legal support *and* increase contracts for attorneys is not consistent with caseload projections at this time.

119. Monroe County

FY 24 approved funding utilized: 89%

FY 25 approved funding: \$3,632,029.54

Spending through Q2: 25%

FY 26 requested funding: \$3,716,889.08

Employee MAC oversees roster of attorneys and will monitor caseloads via spreadsheet/Clio; system will participate in the South-Central Caseload Tracking Pilot Program and also ask attorneys to self-report caseloads. System will make a good faith effort to suspend assignments until an attorney is under the cap. The MAC will review qualifications using an Attorney Evaluation form and provide annual evaluations to attorneys. Clarification is required for in-house training plan offered to roster attorneys.

No plan submitted:

120. City of Westland

Consistent with the MIDC's prior action for non-submissions, it is staff's recommendation to treat this non-submission as a "disapproval" of the plan and cost analysis for purposes of opening the resubmission opportunity within 60 calendar days of the mailing date of the official notification of the MIDC's disapproval, pursuant to M.C.L. 780.993(4).